

THE
CLERGY REVIEW

APRIL, 1961

Journal of International Clergy

ARTICLES

	PAGE
(1) English in the Liturgy: A Report By The Vernacular Society of Great Britain	193
(2) Aberdeen Cathedral By the Bishop of Aberdeen	211
(3) The New English Bible By the Rt Rev. Mgr John M. T. Barton	217
(4) Another View of Teilhard de Chardin By the Rev. Cornelius Ernst, O.P.	223

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(1) Absolution of Dying Non-Catholics	235
(2) Killing in Self-Defence By the Rev. L. L. McReavy	237
(3) Leonine Prayers	240
(4) Reader at Low Mass	241
(5) The Signal for Holy Communion By the Very Rev. Canon J. B. O'Connell	242

CORRESPONDENCE

Realism or Empiricism?	243
Dominus Vobiscum	244
The Celebrant Singing <i>Gloria</i> and <i>Sanctus</i>	244
The Soul and the Human Embryo	246
Missionary Spirituality	246

BOOK REVIEWS

Biography	247
History	251
Short Notices	255

This widely experienced firm of

CATHOLIC FINANCIAL CONSULTANTS

invites enquiries from Parish Priests and Diocesan Financial Secretaries in all matters connected with fund-raising by direct giving.

Hundreds of parishes (including complete dioceses) throughout the British Commonwealth are valued long-term clients, attesting to our ability and integrity.

Cathos Limited

450a HIGH ROAD
WEMBLEY, MIDDLESEX
Telephone: Wembley 5258



THE

NEW

E

IN
G

verna
Grea
at the
amor
oppo
repla
was l
prep
of the
the C
dary
His C
receiv
both

In
A), i
quest
sacra
to the
monk
desire
liturg
Arch
acced
that
sacra

The
two e
Divin
lingu
so it
in th
Vo

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLVI NO. 4 APRIL 1961

ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY: A REPORT

IN MAY 1960 the Committee of The Vernacular Society of Great Britain, which exists "to promote the use of the vernacular in the liturgical worship of the Catholic Church in Great Britain", acting on a resolution taken earlier in the year at the annual general meeting, decided to undertake an enquiry among the clergy to ascertain the amount of support for, and opposition to, proposals that English should to some extent replace Latin in certain parts of the liturgy in this country. It was hoped that the findings of this enquiry might assist in the preparatory work of the Council. Recognizing that the resources of the Society were too small to embark on a national enquiry, the Committee, through its Chairman, the Reverend Prebendary Ronald Pilkington, of Westminster Cathedral, approached His Grace Archbishop King, the Bishop of Portsmouth, and received his permission to send a questionnaire to the clergy, both secular and regular, of that diocese.

In determining the scope of the questionnaire (*see Appendix A*), it was felt that no useful point would be served by asking questions about the use of English for the administration of the sacraments. Not only would these questions have unduly added to the length of the questionnaire, but also it had been commonly understood for many years that there was a widespread desire among both clergy and laity for reform in this part of the liturgy; and an announcement had just been made from Archbishop's House, Westminster, that the Holy See had acceded to a request from the Hierarchy of England and Wales that English be allowed for the administration of some of the sacraments.

The sacraments having been excluded, there remained the two other principal parts of the liturgy, viz. the Mass and the Divine Office. The greatest measure of controversy, when linguistic reforms are discussed, has always centred on the Mass, so it was natural that the Mass should figure more prominently in the questionnaire. To know the particular parts of the Mass

in which the clergy would prefer a use of Latin or English had obviously to be the primary subject of enquiry, but at the same time it was recognized that the findings would be more valuable if they also revealed to which motivating reasons, impelling support for either Latin or English, the greatest importance was attached. In the case of the Divine Office, it was felt that a distinction should be made between the public celebration (i.e. with the people present in church) and the private recitation (i.e. *a solo*) to which the clergy are daily obliged; for the former the great majority of those taking part are non-Latin speaking, whereas for the latter they are bilingual (i.e. in English and Latin).

The liturgy of Holy Week, which has already been considerably reformed in the last decade, has often been urged as a suitable field for linguistic reform. In Germany, for example, the vernacular is much used instead of Latin for the Scriptural lessons, chiefly the Gospels of the Passion, and for certain hymns. It seemed appropriate, therefore, to include some questions on this subject, primarily to determine what parts, if any, of the Holy Week services would be welcomed in English.

The questionnaire was sent in July 1960 to the clergy of the diocese of Portsmouth, which comprises the counties of Hampshire, the Isle of Wight, Berkshire, and the Channel Islands. The clergy numbered 302, divided into 137 secular priests, ordained for the pastoral ministry in the service of the diocese, and 165 regular priests, belonging to various religious orders and congregations. Replies (see Appendix B) were received from 122 priests (representing a 40 per cent response), of whom 60 were secular and 62 regular priests. This report, and any conclusions inferred, must necessarily be based on the replies received; one cannot, *in the context of this enquiry*, say that those who did not reply are in favour of, or opposed, or neutral with regard to a change in the liturgical language used in this country: *argumentum ex silentio infirmissimum*.

The replies were analysed under four heads: first, the general feeling; second, the reasons advanced for and against the use of English at Mass; third, the parts of the Mass and the Holy Week services in which English would be welcomed; and fourth, the Divine Office.

THE GENERAL FEELING (*see* Appendix C, Table P)*The Mass*

Among the secular clergy, 70 per cent of parish priests are opposed to any use, but 68 per cent of their curates are in favour of some use of English at Mass, so that, when account has been taken of those priests appointed as chaplains to convents or schools (who were evenly divided in their views throughout almost the whole of the questionnaire), it can be said that only a small majority of secular clergy (55 per cent) are totally opposed to any use of English at Mass. The regular clergy are 58 per cent in favour, and the only priests opposed to English are those working in parishes (64 per cent); the main support for English comes from those who teach (63 per cent) and foreign missionaries (90 per cent); the contemplatives were evenly divided.

The combined results for all priests show a small majority (52 per cent) in favour of some use of English at Mass.

Holy Week

The opposition to the vernacular already noted among parish priests is substantially less where the liturgy of Holy Week is concerned, for only 55 per cent of them express no wish for English in any part of these services; of their curates, 79 per cent want to see English used in certain parts. As a whole, the secular clergy (57 per cent) show a small majority in favour of English. The preference of the regular clergy (65 per cent) for English is now even greater: only the contemplatives are opposed (56 per cent), whilst those working in parishes (64 per cent), those who teach (63 per cent), and the foreign missionaries (100 per cent), are all strongly in favour.

The combined results for all priests show a majority (61 per cent) in favour of some use of English in the liturgy of Holy Week.

The Divine Office

The trend among parish priests, so far against the vernacular, is now just reversed where the private recitation of the Divine Office is concerned: of those who answered this question,

53 per cent would like to say Office in English; in contrast to their earlier trend, a slightly smaller proportion of curates (59 per cent) now agree with their parish priests in preferring English. The effect is that a small majority of secular priests (54 per cent) are in favour of English. The trend among the regular clergy, so far in favour of the vernacular, is sharply reversed at this point: 66 per cent (of those who answered this question) do not want to say Office in English. No group is in favour, and the opposition is more marked among contemplatives and those working in parishes (each 69 per cent), and less marked among foreign missionaries (60 per cent).

The combined results for all these priests show a small majority (56 per cent) against the private recitation of the Divine Office in English.

THE ARGUMENT (*see Appendix D*)

The clergy were invited, as a preparatory question, to decide whether they were either *generally in favour* of some use, or *generally against* any use of English at Mass, and accordingly to number six supporting reasons in the order of their importance.

Reasons in favour of English (Table Q)

No reason emerged with a sufficient lead over the others to merit its being placed first on a six-point scale, but two reasons virtually tied for second place. The didactic purpose (b) of the liturgy, teaching people to know and love their Faith all the better, and the unifying effect (a) of understanding the language used in prayer were acknowledged by all priests as of primary importance; the seculars showed a slight preference for the former (b), and the regulars for the latter (a). The two reasons which tied almost as closely for third place were the fittingness (d) of proclaiming God's Word in the language of God's People, and the consequent improvement (c) of intelligent participation in dialogue masses; the seculars were slightly more impressed by the latter (c), and the regulars by the former (d). Both seculars and regulars agreed in placing almost fourth (on

a six-point scale) the need (e) to make the Mass more interesting and attractive to Catholics and non-Catholics alike, and almost sixth the natural dignity and beauty (f) of the English language.

Reasons against English (Table R)

Here also no single reason emerged with a sufficiently clear lead over the others to merit its being placed first on a six-point scale, and likewise two reasons virtually tied for second place. The detrimental effect (a) on the unity of the Church and the impressiveness (b) of finding the Mass the same everywhere were regarded by all priests as of primary importance;世俗者 showed a marked preference for the former (a), and regulars for the latter (b). The secular clergy gave a high third place to the lack (d) of any popular demand for English, but this reason was rated much lower, almost in fourth place, by the regulars. The regulars gave third place to the destruction (e) of the valuable element of mystery; the seculars were little impressed by that reason and placed it last of all (halfway between fourth and fifth places on the six-point scale). Whilst the seculars placed the charge (c) of disloyalty to the martyrs well down in the third place, this reason was placed almost a point lower, in fourth place, by the regulars. Both seculars and regulars agreed, however, that the difficulty (f) of translating the Latin texts merited a low place (about halfway between fourth and fifth places).

THE MASS (*see Appendix E*)

Having given their reasons for being generally for or against the use of English at Mass, the clergy were now asked to indicate those parts of the Mass in which they would like to see English used. A distinction was made between the liturgy of the Word of God, i.e. the fore-mass, to the end of the sermon (and the Creed), and the eucharistic liturgy, i.e. the holy sacrifice, to the dismissal.

The Fore-Mass (Table S)

In the first part of the Mass, whilst both secular and regular

clergy agree in being opposed to English for the *Kyrie* (63 per cent) and *Gloria* (60 per cent), and in wanting English to be used for the Epistle and Gospel (each 62 per cent), there is a considerable difference between the majorities by which they support the latter proposal: only 53½ per cent of seculars, but 70½ per cent of regulars. Opinion was divided over the Collect: 52 per cent of seculars rejected English, but 63 per cent of regulars accepted it. Of those who completed this part of the questionnaire, 18 per cent added that they would like the prayers at the foot of the altar, 9 per cent the Creed, and 8 per cent the whole of the fore-mass in English. Other parts desired in English received negligible support.

The Holy Sacrifice (Table T)

There was fairly general opposition (61 per cent) among both seculars and regulars to the use of English in the second part of the Mass. The only exceptions were 51 per cent of regulars who preferred English for the Post-Communion and 58 per cent of regulars who wanted the *Pater Noster* in English. Opposition of the regulars (53 per cent) to the *Agnus Dei* was much below the general level, whereas the opposition of the seculars (68 per cent) was at its highest here. Of those who completed this part of the questionnaire, 10 per cent added that they would like the Offertory verse, 10 per cent the people's *Confiteor* and absolution before Holy Communion, and eight per cent the Last Gospel in English. Other parts desired in English received negligible support.

THE LITURGY OF HOLY WEEK (*see Appendix F, Table U*)

The next task for the clergy was to decide whether they would like some parts of the liturgy of Holy Week to be in English.

There was considerable support among both seculars (70 per cent) and regulars (74 per cent) for using English at the reading of the Passion, as also in the other Scriptural lessons, though here the support of the regulars was reduced (68½ per cent). Support was much less (60 per cent) for English in the

various collects, and there was opposition (52 per cent) to English hymns in place of the Latin ones in spite of some slight support among the世俗者 (51 per cent). Of those who completed this part of the questionnaire, no significant number added other parts desired in English.

THE DIVINE OFFICE (*see Appendix G, Table V*)

Finally, two direct questions were addressed to the clergy: would they (a) like the Divine Office, when publicly celebrated, to be in English, and (b) like to be able to recite the Divine Office in English.

There was strong opposition (66 per cent) to the public celebration of the Divine Office in English, though the regulars (63 per cent) were less opposed than the seculars (69 per cent). Yet, whereas 54 per cent of seculars would like to recite the Office in English, 66 per cent of regulars would not like this, giving a small majority (56 per cent) against this proposal.

THE DEBATE

In Part I, after numbering the reasons for and against the use of English at Mass, the clergy were invited to give any other reasons why they would, or would not, welcome more English in the liturgy of the Mass. Many of the priests who completed the questionnaire availed themselves of this opportunity to state their views more fully. One curate put the state of the question very tersely: "The use of English in our worship is plain common sense, and all the reasoning to get round this springs from the ordinary Catholic's unwillingness to criticize anything, even constructively, which has to do with the Church." A Jesuit schoolmaster said: "The fittingness of proclaiming God's Word in the language of God's People is the overriding consideration, with which the didactic purpose of the liturgy and, possibly, the need to make the Mass more interesting and attractive, are intimately connected. The consequent improvement of intelligent participation in dialogue

masses would appear to be less cogent. If the people are not already a community (cf. the unifying effect of the vernacular), a service in English will not make them so, though it may to a greater or less extent strengthen the sense of community. Again, the dialogue Mass in Latin is not necessarily prayed in a mechanical way, while it is quite possible to pray mechanically in English." Many priests argued the case carefully in this way; others preferred to pass a briefer judgement, like the Jesuit schoolmaster who said: "It is neither necessary nor good (to use the vernacular)—mere Protestantism." "The so-called popular demand," wrote a parish priest, "for the vernacular is due to an unrealistic and untrue picture painted by our Catholic Press, bowing to sensationalism and novelty and magnifying out of all proportion the wishes of a *mere minority* of our people, many of whom are *unlearned* and *irresponsible*." Others felt that the matter could be left entirely to the judgement of the ecclesiastical authorities: "I welcome," says a Benedictine monk, "what has already been granted by the Holy See, but not more *salvo meliori Episcoporum iudicio*. Nearly all the faithful now have a Latin-English missal, *ergo nil innovetur nisi quod traditum est* (*vel iam concessum a Sancta Apostolica Sede*)."¹ The use of missals as a solution to the problem of language provoked different conclusions: so a Benedictine schoolmaster says that "the only valid reason, and that an imperative one, for more use of English in the liturgy of the Mass, is to remove all obstacles, as far as possible, to full *comprehension* of, and *participation* in, the liturgy", and he believes "it equally important to remove all intermediaries made necessary by the difficulty of Latin for the ordinary layman, e.g. missals, commentaries, and *a fortiori* vernacular prayers connected with the liturgy—rosaries, devotions, novena prayers, all of which tend to replace a direct and intelligent participation in the Mass". On the other hand a parish priest says: "I would not welcome a change from Latin in any part of the Mass. The missal gives an English translation side by side with the Latin. I have dialogue Mass but I feel that it lacks *piety* and *private meditation*."

Practical considerations were not forgotten. A Benedictine monk says: "Duplication should be avoided—it seems pointless to have to read twice the same passages of the sacred Scriptures";

and a curate says: "To save time on Sundays, I cannot see the point of first reading the Epistle and Gospel in Latin and then again in English." A canon says: "The Mass is repeated in Latin daily, weekly, and if Catholics do not attend to it from childhood in Latin, the vernacular will not improve their devotion . . . when I go to Austria I am at home at Mass because it is in Latin." Another curate says: "English would help to abolish the twenty-minute Mass"; and a Benedictine schoolmaster asks: "What do we do about supply priests from abroad in the summer?"

Another canon writes: "In this problem we should make a clear distinction between those parts of the liturgy that are *variable* and those that are *invariable*. There can be no question of the value of the former being in English; of the latter, a clear case can be made out for the retention of Latin"; and a Franciscan friar working in a parish says: "I am all in favour of having Collect, Epistle, and Gospel in English within the framework of the *rest* of the Mass in Latin."

The compulsory teaching of Latin to all the faithful commended itself to many priests: a Benedictine monk says: "Anybody of reasonable intelligence and goodwill can acquire sufficient Latin to follow the Mass. One does not have to be a scholar for that. If there is a lack of suitable popular grammars, primers, and dictionaries of liturgical Latin, it ought not to be impossible to remedy this deficiency, and to persuade the faithful that a working knowledge of the official language of the Church is worth acquiring." This opinion is shared by the parish priest who said: "In the dialogue Mass, I think people are more attracted to the Latin than to English. Church Latin is within the grasp of all in its simplicity—people can be taught in this way just as competently as in English, if we take the trouble to do so"; but a curate says: "You cannot teach Latin to a congregation on Sunday." The difficulty of acquiring a good command of Latin is emphasized by a parish priest who writes: "Even as a priest I find it most difficult to think and concentrate when using a language other than that which I use in my daily life as the medium of my thoughts and meditations." "The basic reason," says a curate, "is this: God understands English just as much as Latin; I and the people understand

English far better than Latin (and many people do not understand Latin at all); would it not be better, therefore, if we were allowed to talk to God and God was allowed to talk to us in a language we both understood?" "Latin," says a Benedictine monk, "was the language of the Church when England was converted; it has been the liturgical language *ever since*, and it is no less familiar to people now than it was to the pagan Saxons"; yet, "I fail to see," writes another Benedictine, "that the spiritual needs of the people *and* of the great majority of the clergy are served by retaining any Latin. As a serious student of the liturgy, I think it is sufficient for the preservation of ancient and venerable tradition that we adhere to the *form* of the Eucharist, as it has been handed down, retaining the great prayer of the Canon but translated into a comprehensible and dignified English. The whole Mass should, of course, be said aloud." "Why," asks a chaplain to an approved school, "is it not proposed that the principal part of the Canon should be in the vernacular? If your reasons for the vernacular in the Mass are valid, then they would hold good especially for the whole of the Canon, because the Canon enshrines the essence of the Mass, making it different from just a prayer meeting." "Our culture," says a retired parish priest, "is becoming less and less classical, and all Christians in England, except Catholics, worship in their native tongue. The leakage is terrible and largely due, in my experience, to so much Latin. Cardinal Costantini admitted that it had failed to convert China, and I am convinced that the conversion of England is frustrated by our adherence to Latin." A Benedictine contemplative describes the use of English as "a great help to stop the leakage, especially amongst the teenagers"; and another says: "As a measure in preventing the loss of young people to the Faith, a comprehensive form of worship is half the battle." "It is a poor tribute," writes a canon, "to our modern rising standards of education that after ten years at school, children cannot learn these simple bits of another language. To put it in the vernacular is a retrograde step and an indictment of our Catholic schools."

"The great difficulty," as seen by a Jesuit priest working in a parish, "that seems to exist among the Catholic clergy and

laity, is to recite English prayers with clarity and dignity. English in the Mass would go far to destroy any atmosphere of mystery and devotion. Where dialogue Mass is in constant use, in practice many of the congregation tend to avoid that particular Mass or go to churches where there is no dialogue Mass." "Personally, I far prefer Mass in Latin," writes a curate, "but I think personal preferences do not matter a hoot. We must face the fact that today the unity and uniformity provided by Latin all too often mean apathy, ignorance, and indifference, instead of active participation; love and wide experience of the dialogue Mass, and other forms of participation in the vernacular as experienced on the continent, have long since convinced me that you can only hope for real participation and understanding through the vernacular." "In practice," says a Jesuit priest working in a parish, "most people find the dialogue Mass a serious distraction from prayer, owing to the presence of the old, the deaf, and people with defective eyesight and those who cannot read Latin. There always exists in every congregation those few who draw attention to themselves, not always purposefully; the dialogue Mass gives these people a wonderful opportunity."

A Salvatorian schoolmaster says: "Our Blessed Lord spoke to the people in their own language, and that is the finest argument for the use of our mother tongue. He was never afraid to break with traditional practices that were past their usefulness; Latin has served well, but it is time to modify its use." "English," says a parish priest, "is too changeable for use in the Sacrifice of the Mass. Meanings of words vary from decade to decade, bad grammar is creeping in, even in so-called good writing, and different countries seem to have different meanings for important words—almost a different language. The mystery we have is more elegant"; "English," says the Superior of a Jesuit community, "changes week by week", so he insists, "No vernacular in the Mass, please, e.g. *Ecce Sacerdos Magnus* translated as 'Say, boy! The big noise of this show's right here!'"

A parish priest says: "Christ Himself, as far as one can ascertain, spoke the common language. Christ still speaks to the people through the liturgy: why should His voice be jammed?"

"I can think of a hundred reasons," says a canon, "why the Mass should be left as it is": but he does not mention a single one.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee of The Vernacular Society of Great Britain express their thanks to His Grace Archbishop King, Bishop of Portsmouth, for graciously permitting this enquiry among his clergy; to the many priests of the Diocese of Portsmouth, and to the priests of the Order of Saint Benedict, the Order of Preachers, the Order of Friars Minor, the Society of Jesus, the Company of Mary, the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, the Society of the Catholic Apostolate, the Institute of Charity, the Sons of the Heart of Mary, the Salesians of Don Bosco, the White Fathers, and the Society of the Divine Saviour, without whose generous assistance the enquiry would have achieved nothing; to the Editor of *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, for kindly agreeing to publish the Report; and to J. B. Wells and G. Zubrzycki of Finchley Grammar School, for checking certain calculations.

The Committee of The Vernacular Society of Great Britain: The Rev. Prebendary Ronald Pilkington (Chairman), Mr T. E. C. Purvis (Vice-Chairman), Mr P. J. Cassidy (Honorary Secretary), Mr Graham Jenkins (Honorary Treasurer), Mr C. R. A. Cunliffe, B.A., Mr V. J. Evens, The Rev. Francis Hastings, Miss M. A. Wilson-Browne, The Rev. Godric Young, O.F.M., M.B.E., B.A.

APPENDIX A

ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY

A Questionnaire

The reform of the liturgy, initiated by St Pius X and continued under his successors, especially Pope Pius XII, is likely to be completed at the Second Vatican Council. In view of the interest aroused

by suggestions that the Church should make greater use of the vernacular, at the expense of Latin, in the liturgy, The Vernacular Society of Great Britain, with the gracious permission of His Grace the Archbishop-Bishop of Portsmouth, has prepared this questionnaire, in the hope that the findings may assist in the preparatory work of the Council.

PART I—Preparatory questions

(1) If you are *generally in favour* of some use of English in the Mass, number the following reasons in the order of their importance:

- (a) The people would be made *one* with each other in Christ, and so formed into a community, more effectively, if they could pray aloud together and hear the Word of God in a language they understood.
- (b) The liturgy would better achieve one of its purposes, which is to teach people to know and love their Faith.
- (c) In the Dialogue Mass, the people would be able to pray with their minds and hearts and not just in a mechanical way.
- (d) It is more fitting that the Word of God should be proclaimed to the People of God in their own language.
- (e) The Mass would be made more interesting and attractive, not only to our own people, but also to non-Catholics.
- (f) The English language has its own dignity and beauty.

Give any other reasons why you would welcome more English in the liturgy of the Mass:

(2) If you are *generally against* any use of English at Mass, number the following reasons in the order of their importance:

- (a) It would be detrimental to the unity of the Church.
- (b) The Mass would no longer be so impressively the same everywhere.
- (c) Such a change would be disloyal to the traditions of our martyrs in penal times.
- (d) There is no popular demand.
- (e) It would destroy the valuable element of mystery.
- (f) It is difficult to make a fitting translation of the Latin.

Give any other reasons why you would not welcome more English in the liturgy of the Mass:

PART II—The Mass

I would like to see the following parts in English:

(1) *The Liturgy of the Word of God—The Fore-Mass*

- (a) the Kyrie Yes/No
- (b) the Gloria Yes/No
- (c) the Collect Yes/No
- (d) the Epistle Yes/No
- (e) the Gospel Yes/No

Give any other parts from the prayers at the foot of the altar to the Creed, which you would like to be said aloud in English:

(2) *The Eucharistic Liturgy—The Holy Sacrifice*

- (a) the Secret Yes/No
- (b) the Postcommunion Yes/No
- (c) the Preface Yes/No
- (d) the Sanctus Yes/No
- (e) the Pater Noster Yes/No
- (f) the Agnus Dei Yes/No

Give any other parts from the Offertory prayers to the Dismissal, which you would like to be said aloud in English:

PART III—The Liturgy of Holy Week

I would like to see the following parts in English:

- (a) the Passion Yes/No
- (b) other Scriptural lessons Yes/No
- (c) the Collects Yes/No
- (d) the Hymns Yes/No

Give any other particular parts which you would like to be said aloud in English:

PART IV—The Divine Office

- (a) I would like the Divine Office, when publicly celebrated, to be in English.

Yes/No

- (b) I would like to be able to recite the Divine Office in English.

Yes/No

APPENDIX B—THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF PORTSMOUTH

Table O—Number of Questionnaires sent out and returned

		Secular Clergy			Regular Clergy			Grand Total			
		Parish Priests	Curates	Chaplains	Total	Contemplatives	Working in Parishes	Teaching	Foreign Missionaries	Chaplains	Total
Questionnaires sent to		84	38	15	137	34	35	61	28	7	165
Replies received from		33	19	8	60	16	14	19	10	3	62
Replies as a percentage of the number sent out		39%	50%	53%	44%	47%	40%	31%	36%	43%	38% 40%

APPENDIX C—THE GENERAL FEELING

Table P—Number of priests generally in favour of or against English at Mass, during Holy Week, and for the recitation of the Divine Office

		Secular Clergy			Regular Clergy			Grand Total			
		Parish Priests	Curates	Chaplains	Total	Contemplatives	Working in Parishes	Teaching	Foreign Missionaries	Chaplains	Total
Some use of English at Mass		10	13	4	27	8	5	12	9	2	36 63
Generally against		23	6	4	33	8	9	7	1	1	26 59
Some use of English during Holy Week		15	15	4	34	7	9	12	10	2	40 74
Generally in favour of English against		18	4	4	26	9	5	7	0	1	22 48
Generally in favour of the recitation of the Divine Office		17	10	2	29	4	4	7	4	0	19 48
Generally against		15	7	3	25	9	11	6	2	1	37 62
Undecided		1	2	3	6	3	1	1	0	1	6 12

APPENDIX D—REASONS IN FAVOUR OF OR AGAINST ENGLISH IN THE MASS

Table Q—Number of priests who assigned an order of importance to certain reasons in favour of English

Reasons offered in Questionnaire, Part I, Question 1

	Clergy	Order of Importance						Average order on a six-point scale
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
(a) The people would be made <u>one</u> with each other in Christ, and so formed into a community, more effectively, if they could pray aloud together and hear the Word of God in a language they understood.	Secular Regular	13 16	2 5	4 4	2 3	3 2	0 0	2·4 2·0
(b) The liturgy would better achieve one of its purposes, which is to teach people to know and love their Faith.	Secular Regular	9 8	9 18	4 5	1 1	1 1	1 1	2·2 2·1
(c) In the Dialogue Mass, the people would be able to pray with their minds and hearts and not just in a mechanical way.	Secular Regular	2 3	7 4	5 9	3 7	3 6	1 1	3·0 3·5
(d) It is more fitting that the Word of God should be proclaimed to the People of God in their own language.	Secular Regular	3 4	4 5	6 10	5 6	6 3	0 0	3·3 3·0
(e) The Mass would be made more interesting and attractive, not only to our own people, but also to non-Catholics.	Secular Regular	0 3	3 1	5 4	7 10	3 9	1 1	3·7 3·9
(f) The English language has its own dignity and beauty.	Secular Regular	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1	2 5	13 20	5·8 5·7

Table R—Number of priests who assigned an order of importance to certain reasons against English

Reasons offered in Questionnaire, Part I, Question 2

	Clergy	Order of Importance						Average order on a six-point scale
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
(a) It would be detrimental to the unity of the Church.	Secular Regular	13 5	1 8	3 3	1 0	3 1	0 0	2·0 2·1
(b) The Mass would no longer be so impressively the same everywhere.	Secular Regular	4 8	10 7	3 2	2 1	2 0	0 0	2·4 1·8
(c) Such a change would be disloyal to the traditions of our martyrs in penal times.	Secular Regular	0 3	2 3	5 5	5 2	2 2	2 2	3·7 4·4
(d) There is no popular demand	Secular Regular	3 2	5 0	6 3	3 3	1 2	4 4	3·8 3·8
(e) It would destroy the valuable element of mystery.	Secular Regular	0 3	1 2	2 4	6 3	5 3	4 4	4·5 3·1
(f) It is difficult to make a fitting translation of the Latin.	Secular Regular	1 3	2 3	3 1	2 0	3 3	7 7	4·4 4·4

ENGLISH USED

Total S—The Total Mass—number of priests who voted "yes" or "no" for English

Table S—The Fore-Mass—number of priests who voted “yes” or “no” for English

<i>Parts of the Mass mentioned in Questionnaire, Part II, Question 1</i>		<i>Clergy</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Majority</i>	<i>As a percentage of total response</i>
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
(a)	<i>the Kyrie.</i>	Secular Regular	18 20	33 33	— —
(b)	<i>the Gloria.</i>	Secular Regular	20 22	33 31	— —
(c)	<i>the Collect.</i>	Secular Regular	25 34	27 20	— 14
(d)	<i>the Epistle.</i>	Secular Regular	29 38	25 16	4 22
(e)	<i>the Gospel.</i>	Secular Regular	29 38	25 16	4 22

Table T—The Eucharistic Liturgy—number of priests who voted “yes” or “no” for English

<i>Parts of the Mass mentioned in Questionnaire, Part II, Question 2</i>		<i>Clergy</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Majority</i>	<i>As a percentage of total response</i>
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
(a)	<i>the Secret</i> .	Secular Regular	17 15	36 36	— —
(b)	<i>the Postcommunion.</i>	Secular Regular	21 27	32 26	11 1
(c)	<i>the Preface.</i>	Secular Regular	18 19	36 34	— —
(d)	<i>the Sanctus.</i>	Secular Regular	20 20	35 34	— —
(e)	<i>the Pater Noster.</i>	Secular Regular	29 17	33 36	13 8
(f)	<i>the Agnus Dei.</i>	Secular Regular	21 23	36 26	— —

APPENDIX F—PARTS OF THE LITURGY OF HOLY WEEK IN WHICH THE CLERGY
WOULD LIKE TO SEE ENGLISH USED

Table U—Holy Week—number of priests who voted “yes” or “no” for English

Parts of the Liturgy of Holy Week mentioned in Questionnaire, Part III	Clergy	Response		Majority	As a percentage of total response
		Yes	No		
(a) the Passion.	Secular	37	16	21	40%
	Regular	40	14	26	48%
(b) other Scriptural lessons.	Secular	37	16	21	40%
	Regular	37	17	20	37%
(c) the Collects.	Secular	39	22	8	15%
	Regular	34	20	14	26%
(d) the Hymns.	Secular	26	25	1	2%
	Regular	24	30	—	11%

APPENDIX G—CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH THE CLERGY WOULD LIKE THE DIVINE OFFICE TO BE IN ENGLISH

Table V—The Divine Office—number of priests who voted “yes” or “no” for English

Circumstances concerning the Divine Office mentioned in Questionnaire, Part IV	Clergy	Response		Majority	As a percentage of total response
		Yes	No		
(a) Public Celebration.	Secular	15	33	—	18%
	Regular	21	36	—	15%
(b) Private Recitation	Secular	29	25	4	7%
	Regular	19	37	—	18%

ABERDEEN CATHEDRAL

THERE is a story of an archbishop who wanted to move back—or was it forward?—the high altar of his cathedral. The comment of his administrator was: “over my dead body”. The archbishop respected his administrator’s wish. When the old man died he was buried under the sanctuary. The altar was then moved back—or was it forward?—over the remains of the administrator.

As a race, Catholics are conservative; they do not like change. One is not courting popularity when one sweeps away the furnishings and decoration that were fashionable in Victorian days. One is especially unpopular with those of the faithful who were born before the turn of the century. What we have done in the Cathedral of St Mary of the Assumption in Aberdeen is to convert a large parish church, built in 1860, into a cathedral building. In doing so, we have given the interior a “new look”, looking hopefully to the future. We have tried to be faithful to liturgical law. Admittedly, there are several more things to be changed or completed in the building, if and when they can be done.

I distinguish four purposes in building a church:

1. To provide a building in which priest and people can carry out the liturgy of the Church.
2. To provide a forum for the teaching function of the Church.
3. To be the centre from which the social action of the people of God radiates.
4. To be the centre towards which those outside the Church are drawn.

I treat the first purpose first.

The chief word-books of the liturgy are the missal, the breviary and the ritual. “A living liturgy” is today a slogan. One can argue that it should be superfluous for the layman to have the libretto in his hands while the liturgy is being carried out. In every sense the librettos of both breviary and ritual are closed books to the layman. He is “alive” to neither one nor the other. The Missal is known to him in translation, but to date

the recommendations of St Pius X's *Motu Proprio* on Sacred Music have made little impression on the laity. I know there are exceptions, but they prove the generality of the statement. Dialogued Mass is our limit. What follows goes to show, I hope, that in Aberdeen, despite all the difficulties, we are working towards a living liturgy.

The doorway into the Church is the Sacrament of Baptism. The administration of this sacrament is everybody's business, as the acceptance into the parish of a new member of the Mystical Body is everybody's concern and joy. Our cathedral font used to be "round the corner" and that not in the sense of having an architectural unit for itself. For more reasons than one we were unable to provide that separate unit. The font has been transferred to the west wall, on the central line of the building. As many as a hundred people can now assist at a baptism. Bishop Blomjous of Mwanza tells me that he has built an open air baptistery, round which 5000 Africans take an active part in the ceremony.

Proceeding to the sanctuary we find the work that required most study. I have stated that the church was built as a parish church. In 1878, when the Scots hierarchy was restored, there was no proper place for a throne and the chapter stalls were frequently pushed about, having no home of their own. In a cathedral building one will expect to find a *cathedra* from which the bishop, seated, can *oversee* and speak to all the people. One will expect the chapter stalls to have a correct placing. The high altar will have the place of honour, in a position that invites the people to active co-operation. It was not easy to effect the necessary conversion of the sanctuary. In the event we had to turn the sanctuary furnishings right round the other way. The altar, now a plain slab of granite, faces the people from a position just outside the triumphal arch. The throne is against the east wall, on the central axis of the building. The chapter stalls are against the north and south walls. To do all this we had to remove the floor of the sanctuary and reset it at different levels. It is now impossible to celebrate Mass except facing the people.

Much hilarity was aroused by the announcement that in Aberdeen cathedral the people would receive holy communion

standing. Shades of the Reformers! It is true that the standing position was common for many centuries, but nowadays it is allowed only when the architecture of the building postulates it. We had no desire to be peculiar. It was just that the required inches were not there and the orientation of the altar presented an extra difficulty. We have pacified the conservatives by having kneeling-benches made for the side altars; on Sundays and festivals these are brought together before the high altar.

And now for a very important subject: the placing of the singers and of the organ. The choir and the organ-loft were at the west end. The story is told that in 1903 the cathedral choirmaster's son came back a priest from the Scots College in Rome. He came full of the *Motu Proprio* and tried to convert his old father, who was much addicted to eighteenth-century classical music. The old man listened in silence and terminated the interview by remarking: "Father Pat, you mind your end of the kirk and I'll mind mine." In the early days of the work on the cathedral we wondered how we could rebuild the organ at the east end and have the singers near the altar. The problem was serious and in the end we left things as they were. Pius XII's decree of September 1958 made up our minds for us. He allowed ladies and strings. Perhaps with these stout reinforcements in the loft a new phase of antiphonal singing lies ahead, choir and people alternating. The idea is not new, but Masses like Arthur Oldham's *Missa Beatae Mariae Virginis* will encourage the people to sing. Whatever happens, the people must sing!

There is now a separate chapel for the Blessed Sacrament. As this dominates the south aisle, week-day Masses are celebrated there. The altar-piece is an oil painting by Felix McCullough, of Edinburgh. It shows a seated Christ, teaching and revealing the sacred wounds. We have thus gathered together devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and devotion to the Sacred Heart of our Lord.

The lovely chapel under the great spire is now the chapel of our Lady of Aberdeen, patroness of the city and of the diocese. The original statue was taken to the Low Countries in 1620 and is now the centre of lively devotion in the church of the Finistere in Brussels. She has become *Notre Dame du Bon Succes*, a

title which is not in favour, they say, with the Sacred Congregation of Rites. It sounds Scotch, but isn't. Mr Dapré has carved for us a beautiful replica which graces our Lady Chapel.

St Joseph has a new chapel in the south-west angle. This serves as a mortuary chapel. That in the north-east angle has not yet been dedicated. The other offices now in use include a chapter room, where the choir practises, a clergy vestry, a vestry and a wash place for St Stephen's Guild, and a working sacristy.

I come now to discuss the second purpose which I attributed to a church: to provide a forum for the teaching office of the Church. An important addition to the furnishings of our building is a public address system. The speakers are at the altar, at the throne and at the two ambos which have been placed still nearer the people than the altar. It might well be objected that the old pulpit was more suitable for preaching, even though it was situated part of the way down the nave. In installing ambos we had in mind not only the preaching of the word, but also the singing of the Epistle and Gospel, facing down the nave. Apart from the fact that a speaker can now be heard throughout the whole building, the microphone is a powerful aid to leading the people in prayers and in singing. It is particularly effective at a Dialogue Mass.

I say here quite frankly that I hope the ambos will be in use after the General Council for chanting the Epistle and Gospel in English. Why should I be shy to advocate a "vernacular" liturgy when so many bishops on the continent and in the missions are making an anguished appeal for it? Of course, there are two sides to the question and we shall gladly accept the ruling of the General Council, whatever it may be. In any case, we must be content with evolution without revolution. Meantime I am not impressed by the argument from Cook's Tours; and the fore Mass is mostly lost on the hungry sheep, as are the divine office and the ritual. I do not advocate less Latin for the clergy, but more. I would advocate in the seminaries more reading and more writing of Latin, not necessarily Classical Latin.

There is little point in my ventilating here the hope that a new arrangement of the year's liturgy will allow of a system of

instruction stemming from the liturgy. It is easier said than done. One has heard an instruction on hell on Whitsunday. The reading of the Sacred Scriptures and the exposition of the faith are becoming ever more important. The clamour of the outside world becomes ever more deafening. Visual aids are more and more necessary. Within the action and spectacle of the sacred liturgy we must get the good word across to the people. It is a matter of the greatest urgency. I do not forget the splendid apostolate of the Catholic Press, but what percentage of the faithful study it? "Faith cometh by hearing." It is not right to push the text too far, but the only chance most of our people have of retaining and of increasing their faith is at Sunday Mass. A bishop should be the last to complain when the number of Masses increases. However, every added Mass makes leisurely preaching and listening more difficult.

A third purpose in building a church is to provide a centre from which radiates the social action of the Church. Round the altar our people should learn a common purpose in life. Their congregating should make of the church a springboard launching them into the social life of their community. A live congregation will leave the church to break up into natural groupings for social influence. These groups will carry the faith, the life, the love which they learned at the altar, into the larger community. Most of us know the social teaching of the Church as a series of safeguards—negative doctrine. Pope Pius XII, developing the teaching of Leo XIII and Pius XI, gave us a vast, global, positive programme for society. How can we get it over to the people at the many Masses? It is easier outside the cities, where it is less necessary.

A priest in America recently compared American churches to cinemas, with people coming and going, with no knowledge of one another, or interest in one another. A point which the cinema scores is that you pay your offering on entering and are not bothered by two collections during the show. Every time you put on another Mass you split your congregation. I know it cannot be helped. I make these points to show the difficulties in the way of effective teaching and of fusing the parish into a united, live, missionary Corpus Christi.

A fourth purpose in building a church is to provide a centre

which will attract those outside the Church. The layman is the best advertiser of the Faith. He lives hourly in an environment which he can influence. It is he who should draw men to Him who has been lifted up before us. When the "outsider" comes into the church, he should find us a united family, there because we want to be there. We have the six ferias for private prayer. On Sunday we should be singing, praying, listening together, *in idipsum*. If the visitor discovers a prevailing boredom, we should ask ourselves who is to blame, what scandal is given, what golden opportunities are being lost.

As this article has been asked for because the clergy are interested in what has been happening in Aberdeen, I mention one or two more points. One is the question of statuary. Our cathedral is a simple structure which does not lend itself to statuary. The east end and the nave used to be cluttered with statues. St Anthony and St Bernadette are being allowed in at the west end. Our Lady presides over her own chapel. For the rest there is no place for more than murals. I hope each chapel will have a painting of its dedication.

The building is well heated by low pressure hot water through radiators heated by oil. The effect has been disturbed by the enforced removal of radiators from the new sanctuary. This has created a strong current of cooled air from the sanctuary into the nave. Since the system was installed, I have looked with envy at the hot-air system which has been installed in the abbey church at Fort Augustus. It is cheap to instal and cheap to run. It does not involve a multitude of radiators and blackened walls. But heating of the floor is the fashion today. In our circumstances that was impossible.

A loud-voiced critic has damned the work done in our cathedral as a reversal towards Calvinism. He says that visitors looking round think they are in a Protestant church and that the Catholics among them take their leave. That may or may not be true. If simplicity and good taste are a monopoly of the Protestants, we had better take a leaf out of their book.

If we look back over the four purposes for a church, it is evident how far off most of us are from this ideal, this necessary target. Thank God we already have all the essentials. But how much waits to be done. I have endeavoured to explain what we

have
ideas,
has be
Gray,
good
cathed
work
credit
clergy
all the
all the
The s
we liv
done,
by th

A
1927
those
the
enth

of the
plete
resu
brie

have done and why we have done it. I have tried to explain the ideas, for what they are worth. I have involved "we" in what has been done. The pronoun includes the architect, Mr Charles Gray, F.R.I.B.A., of Edinburgh. The work was made light by his good taste, his patience and his courage. Nor must I forget the cathedral clergy, who for many months had to carry on their work at much inconvenience. The faithful themselves deserve credit. They have suffered the inconvenience along with the clergy. They have contributed generously to an expensive job, all the more generously in that many did not understand what all the fuss was about. Probably many do not yet understand. The stage has been set. We have still no reason to boast that we live a very liturgical life in Aberdeen. Much remains to be done, by the bishop, by the clergy, by the Guild of St Stephen, by the choir and by the faithful.

✠ FRANCIS WALSH
Bishop of Aberdeen

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

ANYONE who remembers the long struggle for parliamentary approval of the revised Anglican Prayer Book in the years 1927 and 1928 may well recall the engaging lines, modelled on those of Gilbert and Sullivan, that described faithfully enough the *dramatis personae*, one of whom was made to speak with enthusiasm of

Our twenty-years-thought new Book,
Our prayerfully-planned new Book,
Our no-change-doctrinal, our quite semi-final
Richly enriched new Book.

This is now ancient history, but the most recent translation of the New Testament into English has only lately been completed and was published on 14 March. It, too, has been the result of many years of prayerful planning, the story of which is briefly set out in the preface and introduction to the work. The

preface by Dr Alwyn Williams, Bishop of Winchester, is the same in both the library and the popular editions, whereas the introduction and the textual notes are given in full only in the first of these editions.¹

The introduction recalls the fact that it is just three hundred and fifty years since King James's translators put out the Authorized Version of 1611, styled by the late Professor J. S. Phillimore in his writings on the subject the "Government Bible". Nearly three hundred years later there appeared the Revised Version of 1881, and it is something of an understatement to say that "textual criticism has not stood still" during the eighty years that have elapsed since the revision was completed. One of the effects of further detailed study is that there is now no one group of manuscripts that would command the assent so eagerly given by Westcott and Hort, and their followers, to the codices representing their so-called Neutral text. The present group of translators has had to consider the manuscript evidence on its merits, and a not over-large selection of variant readings has been recorded in the footnotes to the English text.

Having decided this matter of the text the translators had next to consider the best approach to an understanding of the original Greek, and, as a result of a better knowledge of the Greek language and in particular of the "knowledge of the kind of Greek used by most of the New Testament writers", it has been possible to enjoy "a better appreciation of the finer shades of idiom, which sometimes clarifies the meaning of passages in the New Testament" (p. viii).

Fortunately for the present group of scholars they were not, like the producers of the 1881 revision, pledged to introduce as few changes as possible in the language of the Authorized and the earlier English versions. The joint committee decided from the start that there was need, not for a fresh revision of the Authorized Version, but for a new rendering in modern English which would replace Greek idioms and constructions by those of contemporary English. This led, none too soon, to the abandonment of the principle, so dear to the 1881 revisers, of

¹ *The New English Bible. New Testament.* Library edition. xiii+447 pp. 21s. Popular edition. xi+432 pp. 8s. 6d. (Oxford and Cambridge Presses. 1961.)

rendering the same Greek word throughout by the same English word. One result of this decision was that the present translators were often forced to make a decision as to exact meaning, where their predecessors were seemingly content to leave the meaning ambiguous. Such a change of policy carried with it an element of risk, but, as the author of the introduction rightly concludes: "We have thought it our duty to take the risk rather than remain on the fence" (p. ix).

The panel of scholars appointed by the joint committee was held to be the best available, and the method followed was to invite a member to submit his own rendering of a book or part of a book. This version was circulated in typescript to all the members, and was then discussed, verse by verse, at their meetings. Where there was a notable difference among the members on the meaning of some passage, the rendering that was not selected to be part of the text was sometimes given as a variant in a footnote.

The final paragraphs of the introduction explain the panel's intention of offering a translation, not a paraphrase. "But," they add, "if the best commentary is a good translation, it is also true that every intelligent translation is in a sense a paraphrase" (p. x). Yet only very rarely have they taken "the liberty of introducing into a passage something which is not there, to elucidate the meaning which is there. . . ." The general result is that the version lays claim to being a translation "free, it may be, rather than literal, but a faithful translation nevertheless, so far as we could compass it".

As in the making of the excellent *Bible de Jérusalem* the group of Biblical scholars has been assisted by literary advisers, who have been concerned to make the version exhibit "the tone and level of language appropriate to the different kinds of writing to be found in the New Testament. . . ."

The history of the version is summarized in the preface, which makes it plain that the first move was in May 1946, when the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland received a message from the Presbytery of Stirling and Dunblane calling for a version of the Bible in the modern idiom. Following upon this move, delegates of the Anglican, Presbyterian, and the leading Nonconformist bodies met in October of that year, and

recommended that the work of making a completely new translation should be put in hand. A second conference, in January 1947, appointed representatives to sit on the joint committee, which had its first meeting in July of the same year. By the time of the third meeting, in January 1948, invitations had been sent to other bodies, such as the Society of Friends, churches in Wales and in Ireland, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the National Bible Society of Scotland. It is not clear whether any invitations were ever sent to either Catholics or Jews, but it is certain that neither of these fairly considerable groups has, so far, had any hand in the work of translation.

In all, four panels were appointed, which dealt respectively with the Old Testament, the deuterocanonical writings, the New Testament, and the literary revision of the whole work. A graceful tribute is paid to the great Professor C. H. Dodd, whose seventy-seventh birthday falls on 7 April, and who "as Director of our enterprise has devoted to it in full measure his scholarship, his patience and his wisdom".

Now, after so many years of planning and contriving, and so much invasion of the contributing scholars' time, we are entitled to ask whether the project has justified itself. The answer must certainly be that it is a good and workmanlike translation, in which great pains have been taken to be even more useful to a reader without access to the original texts than the existing versions have been. It must, of course, be borne in mind that many other translations have been produced since 1881, among which a high place might be claimed for the Westminster New Testament, completed in 1935 and issued in a smaller format in 1947, and the New Testament in the Revised Standard Version, published in 1946. Generous permission is given for the use of the new version in quotations, so it may be useful to compare a passage from that very fine translation, the Rheims version of 1582, with the latest rendering. Admittedly the passage chosen is one of the finest in the Rheims version. It is recommended by the late Dom Roger Huddleston, O.S.B., in his edition of the Rheims, published in 1926, as "a specimen of Martin's style at its best". It is the First Epistle of St Paul to Timothy, chapter vi, and I have chosen verses 11-16 for comparison.

Rheims Version of 1582

But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and pursue justice, piety, faith, charity, patience, mildness. Fight the good fight of faith: apprehend eternal life, wherein thou art called, and hast confessed a good confession before many witnesses. I command thee before God who quickeneth all things, and Christ Jesus who gave testimony under Pontius Pilate, a good confession: that thou keep the commandments without spot, blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in due times the Blessed and only Mighty will shew, the King of Kings and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, and inhabiteth light not accessible, whom no man hath seen, yea neither can see, to whom be honour and empire everlasting. Amen.

New English Bible, 1961

But, you, man of God, must shun all this, and pursue justice, piety, fidelity, love, fortitude, and gentleness. Run the great race of faith and take hold of eternal life. For to this you were called, and you confessed your faith nobly before many witnesses. Now in the presence of God, who gives life to all things, and of Jesus Christ, who himself made the same noble confession and gave his testimony to it before Pontius Pilate, I charge you to obey your orders irreproachably and without fault until our Lord Jesus Christ appears. That appearance God will bring to pass in his own good time—God who in eternal felicity alone holds sway. He is King of kings and Lord of lords; he alone posseseth immortality, dwelling in unapproachable light. No man has ever seen or ever can see him. To him be honour and might for ever! Amen.

There is not any great variation between the two versions as renderings of the Greek, though the N.E.B.'s "fortitude" may be slightly better in the context than the Rheims "patience" as a rendering of *hypomenē*. The new version may be commended for avoiding the rather awkward construction "who gave testimony . . . a good confession", though the Westminster Version here continues in the tradition of Rheims, whereas Fr F. A. Spencer, O.P., in his version published in 1937, and the Revised Standard Version, are on the side of the newest version. It does seem, however, that the magnificence of the Rheims in this passage is in no way equalled by the new rendering with its makers' tendency to avoid a longish sentence with many relative clauses.

Another passage that may well serve as an illustration of the new version's merits and defects may be found in the opening verses of the Epistle to the Romans, which have given difficulty to most translators. Here a comparison may be allowed between Fr Spencer's version and the latest one.

Fr F. C. Spencer (published 1937)
Romans I, 1-6

Paul, servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart to preach the Gospel of God which He had formerly promised through His prophets in the Holy Scriptures respecting His SON—who was born from the SEED OF DAVID according to the flesh, but in power was marked out to be SON of God by the Spirit of sanctification, through His resurrection from the dead—Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we have received grace and apostleship in all the nations to subdue them to faith for His Name's sake, among whom you also are called to be Jesus Christ's own. . . .

New English Bible, 1961
Romans I, 1-6

From Paul, servant of Christ Jesus, apostle by God's call, set apart for the service of the Gospel.

This Gospel God announced beforehand in sacred scriptures through his prophets. It is about his Son: on the human level he was born of David's stock, but on the level of the spirit—the Holy Spirit—he was declared Son of God by a mighty act in that he rose from the dead: it is about Jesus Christ our Lord. Through him I received the privilege of a commission in his name to lead to faith and obedience men in all nations, yourselves among them, you who have heard the call and belong to Jesus Christ. . . .

Here again, there is no question about the accuracy and clarity of the 1961 version, but it has the disadvantage of having, as it were, to take at least two breaths in the course of a single sentence, whereas Fr Spencer's rendering, in agreement with the Westminster and the Revised Standard Versions, manages to avoid the two interruptions of "It is about his Son" and "It is about Jesus Christ our Lord".

Briefly, it may be said regarding the new venture that it is a sound and interesting version, but not a very exciting one. Mgr Knox's version, with all the disadvantages of its not being a direct rendering of the Greek and Hebrew originals, succeeds in being a more adventurous version, and in whetting the appetite for the pleasant task of re-reading him. Perhaps there is something to be said, after all, for a version that is the work of one man, and not of a committee.

The variant readings in this new version are neither numerous nor important. What, it may be asked, is the attitude of the present translators to those passages that were omitted from the Greek text of Westcott and Hort and were sometimes relegated to the margin by the revisers of 1881? The position in regard to the longest of these, Mark xvi, 9-20 (which the revisers printed in their text with a footnote stating that: "The

two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities omit from verse 9 to the end"), is that the latest version prints these verses as part of the text, but has a note to much the same effect as that provided by the 1881 committee. In Luke vi, 1, where the revisers of 1881 have: "Now it came to pass on a sabbath" (with a footnote referring to "second-first"), the newest venture has simply "One Sabbath" and no footnote. Luke xxii, 43-4 (the verses on the angel of the agony, and the sweat of blood) which Westcott and Hort print between double brackets and which the revisers allowed to stand in the text, is here retained in the text, but there is a footnote: "*Some witnesses omit*". The episode of the woman taken in adultery (John vii, 53-viii, 11) is printed in an appendix (in the larger edition at p. 193) and the *Comma Joanneum* (I John v, 7) is omitted altogether from both text and footnotes.

JOHN M. T. BARTON

ANOTHER VIEW OF TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

IN AN issue of THE CLERGY REVIEW last year Fr William Donnelly, s.j., published an interesting and honest account of the views of a writer whose name has now become known to many people, probably for the first time, after the appearance of the excellent English translation of his most important work, *The Phenomenon of Man*.¹ It might seem unnecessary to return to Fr Teilhard's views so soon; and yet whatever sympathy might be felt for his ideas and for Fr Donnelly's skilful exposition of them, there can be no doubt that they are open to criticism the seriousness of which Fr Donnelly has not perhaps made wholly clear. The purpose of this short note is to indicate some of the theological difficulties involved in Fr Teilhard's views, primarily in *The Phenomenon of*

¹ "The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin", THE CLERGY REVIEW, June 1960, pp. 324-49.

Man; theologically relevant difficulties of a scientific and philosophical character will also be touched on briefly.¹

Fr Donnelly began his paper with a sympathetic account of the historical background against which Fr Teilhard's work must be seen, making excellent use of the well-known pastoral letter of Cardinal Suhard. Yet his account would be incomplete and indeed misleading without some reference to that movement, so full of apostolic fervour and so eager to respond to the needs of the time, which came to be known as "*la nouvelle théologie*", an expression which was given a certain authority by Pius XII in his address to the 29th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus.² The outstanding figure in this movement was Fr Henri de Lubac, s.j., and its most characteristic literary product was his monumental work *Surnaturel*. As is well known, some of the tendencies associated with this movement finally led to the intervention of the *magisterium* in that essential document of the intellectual life of the Church in modern times, the encyclical *Humani Generis* of 12 August 1950. The sharpness with which Pius XII there rebuked certain Catholic thinkers for a lack of moderation in adopting novel modes of thought and expression at the expense of the theology and philosophy sanctioned by the use of the Church for several centuries only becomes intelligible in the light of some knowledge of the excesses of the movement and of some appreciation of the extraordinary complexity of the intellectual demands made upon the Church in our time (which is to say in the last 150 years).

¹ A vast literature has now grown up around Fr Teilhard's own writings. I have found the following studies particularly useful: Olivier A. Rabut, o.p., *Dialogue avec Teilhard de Chardin* (Paris 1958); Nicolas Corte, *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin* (London 1960; ET. Martin Jarrett-Kerr); P. B. Grenet, *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin ou le philosophe malgré lui* (Paris 1960; this work contains a number of articles originally published in *L'Ami du Clergé* in 1958-9). Other references, notably to the special issue of *Divinitas* of April 1959, may be found in Fr Donnelly's article. Some of the points discussed in this note have already been raised by the present writer in *The Tablet* of 7 May 1960 and in the subsequent correspondence.

² A.A.S., 38 (1946), p. 385: "Plura dicta sunt, at non satis explorata ratione, 'de nova theologia' quae cum universis semper volventibus rebus, una volvatur, semper itura, nunquam perventura. Si talis opinio amplectenda esse videatur, quid fieri de nunquam immutandis catholicis dogmatibus, quid de fidei unitate et stabilitate?" This passage immediately follows the text quoted by Fr Donnelly, art. cit. pp. 332-3. A good account of some of the tendencies associated with this "new theology" may be found in T. Deman, o.p., "Tentatives françaises pour un renouvellement de la théologie", *Revue de l'Université de l'Ottawa*, 20 (1950), pp. 129*-67*.

But on
Church
philoso
that pl
be no
develop

It i
with t
were c
is no
and sp
among
sough
circul
were
one w
prim
prude
as un
his de
theolo
as a C
lated
theolo
knew
"Evo

C
of "I
Evol
men
Cath
theor
origi

¹ C
des L

mène
nation
diat
cienti
V

But one thing at least is made clear by *Humani Generis*: that the Church will not tolerate attempts to renew her theology and philosophy which reject any part of the long history in which that philosophy and theology have been worked out: there can be no "renewal" which is not continuous with the Church's development and subject to her living authority to teach.

It is not without reason that Fr Teilhard has been associated with this "new theology", though his special qualifications were certainly not those of a theologian or a philosopher. There is no doubt that he was acutely conscious of the intellectual and spiritual needs of his time, especially those of the scientists among whom he worked; and there is also no doubt that he sought to meet them by a number of writings which began to circulate in cyclostyled copies as early as the 1920s.¹ Views were expressed in these writings which will be familiar to anyone who has read the works so far published without an *imprimatur* since 1955, though it appears that there has been some prudent editing.² I must frankly state at this point that I regard as untenable the plea so often put forward by Fr Teilhard and his defenders that he wrote merely as a scientist and had no theological pretensions. It is quite true that he was ill-equipped as a Catholic theologian, but none the less he made and circulated statements which were theological because they bore on theological topics, offering in fact a reinterpretation of what he knew of Christian revelation in terms of his dominant vision of "Evolution".

On the matter of evolution (the scientific theory) as well as of "Evolution" (the "systema evolutionismi" or "generalized Evolution") *Humani Generis* offers some unequivocal recommendations, however unpalatable they may be to a number of Catholic intellectuals. As regards the first point (the scientific theory), freedom of discussion is permitted concerning the origin of the human body from animate matter,³ provided that

¹ Cf. M. L. Guérard des Lauriers, O.P., in *Divinitas* 3 (1959), p. 222. Fr Guérard des Lauriers lists thirty of these writings.

² According to Corte, op. cit., p. 93, in its "semi-clandestine" form *Le Phénomène humain* contained assertions of the necessity of the Creation and the Incarnation.

³ The parenthesis which follows here in the text—"animas enim a Deo immediate creari catholica fides nos retinere iubet"—does not seem to have been sufficiently noted. In the first place it declares more strongly than ever before that the

the arguments on either side are weighed with due seriousness, moderation and temperateness: there are some who have rashly dared to treat the evolutionary theory as absolutely certain, as though there were nothing in the source of divine revelation which required the utmost caution in this matter.¹ It can hardly be said that Fr Teilhard's writings fulfil these conditions.

Doubtless it will be urged that the caution demanded by the encyclical is excessive in view of the quasi-unanimity of biologists as regards the scientific validity of evolutionary theory. Dr W. R. Thompson, F.R.S., a determined critic of evolutionary theory, writes as follows:

I am of course well aware that my views will be regarded by many biologists as heretical and reactionary. However, I happen to believe that in science heresy is a virtue and reaction often a necessity, and that in no field of science are heresy and reaction more desirable than in evolutionary theory.²

This testimony establishes both the fact of the majority view and the fact that it is still open to criticism by a distinguished working scientist. In fact the opposition is by no means as clear cut as all that, and no one who had the sketchiest acquaintance with the history and philosophy of science would expect it to be otherwise. The structure of evolutionary theory, particularly in its modern form, is complex enough to allow of divergencies and differences of opinion, as one would expect in an empirical science. It is clear, even on the "phenomenological" level, that biology cannot by itself answer or even properly put the question of the origin of man, but that historical considerations

immediate creation of *all* human souls (not merely Adam's) is *de fide catholica*; secondly, in virtue of its context, it implies that the immediate creation of the human soul of the first man is or might be a special case of the general mode of divine intervention in a process of biological generation.

¹ Denz 2327 (numeration of ed. 31).

² Introduction to the new Everyman edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1958). A representative statement of the majority view of Darwin's work may be conveniently found in *A Century of Darwin*, ed. S. A. Barnett (London 1958). See also John Maynard Smith, *The Theory of Evolution* (Penguin Books 1958). The debate between Professor P. B. Medawar and Dr Bernard Towers on the Third Programme at least made it clear that Fr Teilhard's evolutionary theory is not the only scientifically tenable one.

have to intervene: palaeontology cannot be properly practised by someone who is simply a "naturalist".¹

This brings us to a much more important point. Even if the biological picture of man's evolutionary origin were entirely clear, this would still by no means justify us in adopting the world-view of "generalized Evolution". Once again *Humani Generis* has some very sharp words about those who rashly extend the "systema evolutionismi" to the origin of all things, and entertain the monistic and pantheistic speculation of a universe subject to continuous evolution.² The charge of Evolutionary monism is one which touches Fr Teilhard very nearly.

Firstly, as regards the *subject* of evolutionary change. It is unnecessary to multiply citations here: there can be no doubt that for Fr Teilhard there is a single "stuff of the universe", "the element", which forms the unique subject of Evolution. This "stuff" exhibits at all levels of complexity the joint aspects of materiality and consciousness in a sort of universal psycho-physical parallelism.³ The more complex the material structure, the higher is the associated consciousness. Psycho-physical parallelism has long been recognized as a hopelessly muddled philosophical view even when applied to entities in which some sort of "consciousness" is observable; that it should now be generalized and exultantly applied to every conceivable entity is a little embarrassing.

But secondly the process of Evolution itself is monistically unique in Fr Teilhard's view. I shall allow myself two citations here from *The Phenomenon of Man*:

In short, first recognized only at a single point, then perforce extended to the whole inorganic and organic volume of matter,

¹ Cf. Adolf Portmann, "Das Ursprungsproblem", in *Biologie und Geist* (Zürich 1956). See also *Zoologie und das neue Bild des Menschen* (Hamburg 1956). Portmann is Director of the Basle Zoological Institute; he and Dr Thompson are rare among biologists in enjoying a wide philosophical culture.

Is it necessary to remark here that I myself have not the slightest "psychological" difficulty in accepting the view that I am biologically continuous with pre-human life?

² Denz 2305.

³ Fr Tony Kenny has made a particularly searching examination of Fr Teilhard's philosophical (Cartesian) naiveties in this respect. See the *Bulletin of the Newman Association Philosophy of Science Group*, no. 37, January 1960. Bulletin no. 38 (April) contains a number of objections to Fr Kenny's analysis, and his reply.

evolution is now, whether we like it or not, gaining the psychic zones of life and transferring to the spiritual constructions of life not only the cosmic stuff but also the cosmic "primacy" hitherto reserved by science to the tangled whirlwind of the ancient "ether" (p. 221).

The passing wave that we can feel was not formed in ourselves. It comes to us from far away; it set out at the same time as the light from the first stars. It reaches us after creating everything on the way. The spirit of research and conquest is the permanent soul of evolution (p. 224).

The "fundamental vision" is that man is "the arrow pointing the way to the final unification of the world in terms of life" (p. 224).

Thus the universe, including and culminating in socialized man, is a single Process of Evolution, governed throughout by the law of "complexity-consciousness". It is remarkable that not even Fr Teilhard's critics seem often to recognize that this generalization of Evolution, by identifying human history with a prolongation of biological change, either empties "Evolution" of any precise meaning or utterly fails to do justice to what is ontologically and irreducibly novel in human historical event. Fr Teilhard's friend and associate the Abbé Breuil, for instance, offers the following account of "Evolution", said to be their common view:

The principle of Evolution . . . is only the scientific method itself applied to everything of every kind that develops within time. . . . "To know that everything real, whatever it is, comes largely from what precedes it, and is itself largely the source of what follows it": we can postulate this without making any inferences outside the order of tangible things, about the spiritual principle which orders this succession of events in developing stages. *This process is not a hypothesis, but the definition of the method.*¹

Thus, it appears, the thinker, his activity of thought and its object, and the intrinsic intelligibility of this thought itself, are all instances of a single principle; and this principle turns out

¹ Cited in Corte, op. cit., pp. 84-5.

to be equivalent ("largely") to the law that entities in time are subject to temporal succession. In fact, of course, more is meant than this: the succession is a *genesis* and an *ascent*. We must now ask whether this single continuous genesis—cosmogenesis, biogenesis, noogenesis, it is all one—can be allowed to absorb human history.¹

It should be made clear at once that by "history" here is meant primarily not the subject-matter of a chronicle but the enacted activity of human beings which makes that subject-matter and its retrospective chronicling possible: history in this sense implies the ontological capacity of "historicity" (*Geschichtlichkeit*), a concept which has itself been historically developed over the last 150 years, and more particularly in recent years by such writers as Heidegger. The essential difference between development ("evolution") in natural process and development in historical process is that in the latter human freedom enters intrinsically into the movement of the process, a human freedom which, in scholastic terms, is not only a *libertas specificationis* but also a *libertas exercitii*. There may be some sort of analogue (though only an analogue) to the *libertas specificationis* in natural process (variability and adaptation); there can be no such analogue to the *libertas exercitii*, the freedom to act defined as the negation of a negation, the capacity to *posit* an act which by rejecting inactivity constitutes an active transcendence. The human being is the free agent of his own destiny under the all-embracing providence of God.² St Thomas, quoting Damascene at the beginning of the *Secunda Pars*, tells us that man is said to be made according to the image of God in so far as by "image" is meant *intellectuale et arbitrio liberum et per se potestativum (autexousion)*. Human freedom is not just the expression of a uniform pulse or wave of Evolution which "set out at the same time as the light from the first stars"; and it would be an abominable perversion of man's spiritual transcendence to regard it as capable of being absorbed into a cosmology. It may

¹ The translator of *The Phenomenon* refers the reader more than once to Collingwood's *Idea of Nature*. It should be remembered that Collingwood also wrote an *Idea of History*.

² See the article "Geschichtlichkeit", by A. Darlapp in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche IV* (1960), col. 780–3, and related articles on the theology and philosophy of history.

of course be objected that Fr Teilhard was prevented by his own chosen method from discussing anything except in terms of his spiritualized cosmology; and the objection may be formally conceded—is there not a footnote here and a bow to an authority there? But it cannot be denied that Fr Teilhard tried to see *everything* from his special point of view; and it is a grievous error to suppose that one can see everything from everywhere—at any rate, without distortion. The objects of Revelation can only be seen properly, or can only be seen at all, in the light of Revelation; the human spirit can only be properly understood in its own terms, or in the light of a higher illumination.

What has so far been said (very briefly of course) has been aimed at showing that the ontological discontinuity between nature and history, deriving from the spiritual transcendence of human freedom, cannot be resolved or reduced into a uniform Evolutionary genesis. But this same transcendence is distorted in a related and perhaps even more disastrous way by the characteristic omission of any serious consideration of the *moral* character of this freedom. It does not seem that Fr Teilhard made any very sharp distinction between *agere* and *facere*, doing and making.¹ Thus, in a text already quoted, we are told that "the spirit of research and conquest is the permanent soul of evolution". The ultimate stage of Evolution is a "gigantic psycho-biological operation, a sort of *mega-synthesis*" (p. 244), an "organic super-aggregation of souls" (p. 248). "Love in all its subtleties is nothing more, and nothing less, than the more or less direct trace marked on the heart of the element by the psychical convergence of the universe upon itself" (p. 265). A eugenics ("nobly human") applied to individuals must be complemented by a eugenics of society: religion and science (ultimately a "science of human energetics") are "the two conjugated faces or aspects of one and the same act of complete knowledge" (pp. 282-5). What has become in all this of the *morality* of human activity? Is the morally desirable simply to be identified with what contributes to Evolutionary progress? Is human purpose sufficiently defined as an expression of cosmic

¹ This appears still more clearly in *Le Milieu Divin*, and I sincerely hope that Fr Donnelly is wrong in regarding it as "Ignatian" (art. cit., p. 343). The "activités" which Fr Teilhard discusses there are simply explosions of "energies".

purpose? On the contrary: human transcendence is not merely "higher" in relation to a predecessor on an Evolutionary "scale"; it is disclosed only in relation to an *absolute Good*, in an *immediacy* to God. *Natura autem rationalis, in quantum cognoscit universalem boni et entis rationem, habet immediatum ordinem ad universale essendi principium.*¹

Fr Teilhard's lack of interest in the morality of human action is exhibited most sharply in his remarks about sin. Many critics have felt disquiet about Fr Teilhard's inadequacies here, but they have not always seen that his failure sufficiently to appreciate the difference between the evil of suffering and failure and the evil of sin is indivisibly associated with his failure properly to assess the unique *goodness* accessible to man, by nature and by grace. "Philosophers have measur'd mountains," as George Herbert remarked, "But there are two vast, spacious things, The which to measure it doth more behove; Yet few there are that sound them—Sinne and Love" (*The Agonie*). The final deplorable appendix to *The Phenomenon of Man* on "the place and part of evil in a world in evolution" have their inevitable parallel in the definition of love as an Evolutionary "eros" in the heart of the cosmic element. If the Evolutionary universe of Fr Teilhard is moral at all, it is because it moves (or in particular cases fails to move) just as it does move to its convergent culmination.

It is not easy to place Fr Teilhard's error here, and yet it is the fundamental one, involving as it does a monism not only of "nature" and history but also of "nature" and grace. A convenient starting-point is provided by Fr Donnelly's declaration that the master light of Fr Teilhard's vision is the great Johannine and Pauline doctrine of "The Cosmic Christ".² This must be categorically denied, in the sense that the "cosmic Christ" which seems undoubtedly to have been the master light of Fr Teilhard's vision was *not* the Christ of St John and St Paul, though it may be thought to have some resemblance to the mediators of the "pre-gnostic" doctrines which St John and the St Paul of the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians may

¹ IIa-IIae. 2.3. The "cosmological" context of this remark, in an article on the necessity of faith for salvation, makes it specially appropriate here.

² Art. cit., p. 333. A little later (p. 342) Fr Donnelly speaks of Fr Teilhard's Christology. How does one have a Christology without writing as a theologian?

of course be objected that Fr Teilhard was prevented by his own chosen method from discussing anything except in terms of his spiritualized cosmology; and the objection may be formally conceded—is there not a footnote here and a bow to an authority there? But it cannot be denied that Fr Teilhard tried to see *everything* from his special point of view; and it is a grievous error to suppose that one can see everything from everywhere—at any rate, without distortion. The objects of Revelation can only be seen properly, or can only be seen at all, in the light of Revelation; the human spirit can only be properly understood in its own terms, or in the light of a higher illumination.

What has so far been said (very briefly of course) has been aimed at showing that the ontological discontinuity between nature and history, deriving from the spiritual transcendence of human freedom, cannot be resolved or reduced into a uniform Evolutionary genesis. But this same transcendence is distorted in a related and perhaps even more disastrous way by the characteristic omission of any serious consideration of the moral character of this freedom. It does not seem that Fr Teilhard made any very sharp distinction between *agere* and *facere*, doing and making.¹ Thus, in a text already quoted, we are told that "the spirit of research and conquest is the permanent soul of evolution". The ultimate stage of Evolution is a "gigantic psycho-biological operation, a sort of *mega-synthesis*" (p. 244), an "organic super-aggregation of souls" (p. 248). "Love in all its subtleties is nothing more, and nothing less, than the more or less direct trace marked on the heart of the element by the psychical convergence of the universe upon itself" (p. 265). A eugenics ("nobly human") applied to individuals must be complemented by a eugenics of society: religion and science (ultimately a "science of human energetics") are "the two conjugated faces or aspects of one and the same act of complete knowledge" (pp. 282-5). What has become in all this of the morality of human activity? Is the morally desirable simply to be identified with what contributes to Evolutionary progress? Is human purpose sufficiently defined as an expression of cosmic

¹ This appears still more clearly in *Le Milieu Divin*, and I sincerely hope that Fr Donnelly is wrong in regarding it as "Ignatian" (art. cit., p. 343). The "activités" which Fr Teilhard discusses there are simply explosions of "energies".

purpose? On the contrary: human transcendence is not merely "higher" in relation to a predecessor on an Evolutionary "scale"; it is disclosed only in relation to an *absolute Good*, in an *immediacy* to God. *Natura autem rationalis, in quantum cognoscit universalem boni et entis rationem, habet immediatum ordinem ad universale essendi principium.*¹

Fr Teilhard's lack of interest in the morality of human action is exhibited most sharply in his remarks about sin. Many critics have felt disquiet about Fr Teilhard's inadequacies here, but they have not always seen that his failure sufficiently to appreciate the difference between the evil of suffering and failure and the evil of sin is indivisibly associated with his failure properly to assess the unique *goodness* accessible to man, by nature and by grace. "Philosophers have measur'd mountains," as George Herbert remarked, "But there are two vast, spacious things, The which to measure it doth more behove; Yet few there are that sound them—Sinne and Love" (*The Agonie*). The final deplorable appendix to *The Phenomenon of Man* on "the place and part of evil in a world in evolution" have their inevitable parallel in the definition of love as an Evolutionary "eros" in the heart of the cosmic element. If the Evolutionary universe of Fr Teilhard is moral at all, it is because it moves (or in particular cases fails to move) just as it does move to its convergent culmination.

It is not easy to place Fr Teilhard's error here, and yet it is the fundamental one, involving as it does a monism not only of "nature" and history but also of "nature" and grace. A convenient starting-point is provided by Fr Donnelly's declaration that the master light of Fr Teilhard's vision is the great Johannine and Pauline doctrine of "The Cosmic Christ".² This must be categorically denied, in the sense that the "cosmic Christ" which seems undoubtedly to have been the master light of Fr Teilhard's vision was *not* the Christ of St John and St Paul, though it may be thought to have some resemblance to the mediators of the "pre-gnostic" doctrines which St John and the St Paul of the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians may

¹ IIa-IIae. 2.3. The "cosmological" context of this remark, in an article on the necessity of faith for salvation, makes it specially appropriate here.

² Art. cit., p. 333. A little later (p. 342) Fr Donnelly speaks of Fr Teilhard's Christology. How does one have a Christology without writing as a theologian?

have had in mind.¹ The decisive point here of course is that the "cosmic Christ" of Catholic orthodoxy is identically the historical Jesus, who cried *Consummatum est* on the Cross, through whose Blood we are redeemed, whose coming to us was the unexacted gift of God's gracious condescension. The cosmic Christ of Fr Teilhard appears to be no more than another version of the Omega point. I must be allowed to quote at some length:

Is the Kingdom of God a big family? Yes, in a sense it is. But in another sense it is a prodigious biological operation—that of the Redeeming Incarnation.

As early as in St Paul and in St John we read that to create, to fulfil and to purify the world is, for God, to unify it by uniting it organically with himself. How does he unify it? By partially immersing himself in things, by becoming "element", and then, from this point of vantage in the heart of matter, assuming the control and leadership of what we now call evolution. Christ, principle of universal vitality because sprung up as man among men, put himself in the position (maintained ever since) to subdue under himself, to purify, to direct and superanimate the general ascent of consciousnesses into which he inserted himself. By a perennial act of communion and sublimation, he aggregates to himself the total psychism of the earth. And when he has gathered everything together and transformed everything, he will close in upon himself and his conquests, thereby rejoining, in a final gesture, the divine focus he has never left. Then, as St Paul tells us, *God shall be all in all* . . .

The universe fulfilling itself in a synthesis of centres in perfect conformity with the laws of union. God, the Centre of centres. In that final vision the Christian dogma culminates (pp. 293-4).

Christian dogma? It would hardly be necessary to discuss this extraordinary claim seriously if so many honest, loyal and sincere Catholics did not seem to be prepared to defend it. It would be difficult even to deny most of the statements made here; one cannot negate category mistakes. To say that the

¹ Cf. e.g. G. Quispel, "L'Evangile de Jean et la Gnose", in *L'Evangile de Jean. Etudes et Problèmes* (1958); C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1958); H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Düsseldorf 1958). The characteristic Gnostic dualism is of course not present in Fr Teilhard's views; but their insistent euphoria has all the attractiveness of an escape from an unacknowledged evil.

Kingdom of God is a biological operation, that of the Redeeming Incarnation, is like saying that sympathy is a cabbage, that of the solar plexus. Only someone who was totally uninterested in the Biblical and dogmatic theology of the conceptions referred to here could write as Fr Teilhard does—and then why use them?¹ Or again how does God unite the world “organically” with Himself? Was Chalcedon in vain, or of no consequence, or is it merely for the “theologians” and of no concern for the faithful? The only sense I can give to the idea that by the Incarnation God secures a “vantage point” at the heart of matter from which to control Evolution is that cosmic genesis is no longer random or “groping” (a favourite idea of Fr Teilhard’s) but that God now directs it “from within”: He has “organically” assumed and made His own the totality of the Evolutionary genesis, in its conjoined material and psychic aspects. This is the ultimate inclusion into the monistic Process of Evolution: from the “heart of matter” to the “transcendent” God a single dynamic unity prevails and successively unfolds itself. By no means a trivial or uninteresting idea; but not a Catholic one.² The Christ of *The Phenomenon of Man* has indeed a cosmic role, allotted to him in advance by the immanent tendency of the Evolutionary process; but, for all Fr Teilhard’s interest in man, his Christ lacks a human face. “God, the Centre of centres” is not the culmination of Christian doctrine: it is a cosmological transposition which abstracts from the unexacted particularity of God’s gracious revelation in Jesus Christ.

The consequences of such a transposition are fatal. In the New Testament, as it is handed down to us by the Church, we find the revelation of a mysterious purpose of God’s grace, manifested in *history*, such that the cosmos itself participates in the moral character of a love which triumphs over sin and death, and judges the world while redeeming it. The mystery of our Christian existence, and thus of all that is, is the supremely efficacious moral mystery of the crucified and risen *agape*,

¹ On the notion of the Kingdom of God, especially in the New Testament, see e.g. R. Schnackenburg, *Gottes Herrschaft und Reich* (Freiburg 1959).

² Compare the Brahman-Atman of the Upanishads; or again Hegel. The interested reader will find most of Fr Teilhard’s basic ideas (without the Christian superstructure, of course) clearly and briefly expressed by Engels, *Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, pp. 388 s., in Marx-Engels Selected Works II (Moscow and London 1958.)

which anticipates the eschatological transfiguration of the world. In the light of the revelation of that love the Creation itself may be seen as an anticipation and a presupposition of the final consummation.¹ These are not biological categories; but they are the proper categories of Christian revelation. The transposition of an impoverished Catholic doctrine into the improper categories of a generalized biology, and its inflation there by the exuberance of a personal mystique: this would seem to be a fair description of Fr Teilhard's views.² I should qualify them theologically as *favens haeresi*.

It is sometimes made to appear that approval of Fr Teilhard's views is a mark of breadth of vision, evangelical zeal, a fearless freedom of the spirit; and that to reject them, at least in their inner tendency and cohesion, is to show signs of mean-mindedness, clerical obscurantism, a charity grown cold in a narrow prison of obsolete legalism. This is too easy a simplification of the issue. It is better simply to admit that Fr Teilhard's writings are in fact those of a distinguished scientist who was not a theologian or a philosopher and appeared to have very little sense of the proper claims of those disciplines; to admit that his breath-taking visions, however orthodox in their intention and generous in their fervour, derive their plausibility from the omission of essential truths and the reductive distortion of others. Let us recognize that the light of Christian revelation, while furnishing the unique source which illuminates all things, serves also, in the present economy of faith, to emphasize the intrinsic obscurity of human existence within the mysterious designs of God's providence and predestination; and let us, with regret, perhaps, renounce prophetic syntheses which promise glowing visions to those who are willing to surrender to a dream.

CORNELIUS ERNST, O.P.

¹ Cf. V. Warnach, o.s.b., *Agape* (Düsseldorf 1951), and an excellent chapter by F. Malmberg, s.j., on the "motive of the Incarnation" in *Über den Gottmenschen* (Freiburg 1960).

² Professor R. C. Zaehner's *Mysticism, Sacred and Profane* (Oxford 1957), especially the chapter on "Some Nature Mystics", provides a valuable means of locating this mystique.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ABSOLUTION OF DYING NON-CATHOLICS

In view of the fact that High Anglicans and Episcopalianists now believe in Confession, is it not to be held in practice that absolution, given secretly to such dying persons, is not only permitted but obligatory, according to the principle: "Quotiescumque ex sententia certo probabili licet absolutionem dare moribundo, sacerdos ad eam dandam tenetur" (Genicot, II, n. 298)? (A. H.)

REPLY

Canon 731, §2: "Vetitum est Sacraenta Ecclesiae ministrare haereticis aut schismaticis, etiam bona fide errantibus eaque penitentibus, nisi prius, erroribus reiectis, Ecclesiae reconciliati fuerint."

Baptized non-Catholics can validly and fruitfully receive absolution, provided they have the minimum necessary intention and the right disposition of heart, but they are normally debarred from receiving it lawfully by virtue of the above-quoted canon. This prohibition applies equally to those heretics who happen to believe in the sacrament of Penance. Their belief may ensure that they have the intention which is necessary to the valid reception of the sacrament, but it has no effect, *per se*, on the lawfulness of administering it to them, because the primary reason for their exclusion from the sacraments is their lack of communion with the Church. As, however, we endeavoured to show in a lengthy article devoted to the subject, to which we refer our questioner,¹ it is generally agreed that there is room for a liberal interpretation of the law in the case of *dying* non-Catholics who are unable, owing to lack of consciousness, to reject their errors and seek formal reconciliation, and even in the case of those who, though conscious and ready to do what they believe to be their duty,

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW (February 1955), pp. 79-90.

cannot prudently be disturbed in their good faith. The opinion that it is lawful to give conditional absolution to both these categories, *secluso scandalo*, has sufficient support in modern replies of the Holy Office¹ and in the teaching of approved authors to be considered certainly probable. The question is whether it is obligatory to act on this opinion.

There is certainly no obligation of justice, because canon 892, while binding all priests in charity to hear the confessions of the dying, expressly limits the obligation of justice to pastors of souls who have been reasonably requested to hear the confessions "fidelium sibi commissorum"; and though canon 1350 requires pastors to regard non-Catholics living in their territory as "commended to them in the Lord", these latter are not part of their committed flock, as long as they remain separated from the communion of the one Fold. There is a bond of charity between them, but no quasi-contract of service entailing a duty of strict justice.

As to the requirements of charity, we agree with Noldin and Regatillo² that no certain obligation of giving conditional absolution to dying non-Catholics can be established, even when it would be lawful to do so, as long as positive doubt remains as to whether they have at least implicitly rejected their errors and sought reconciliation with the Church; for this is a condition of their admission to the sacraments, and it is only on a presumption of its fulfilment that authors justify their conditional absolution. A reasonable presumption can provide the basis of a lawful action, but not of a certain obligation. The certain obligation of charity to dying non-Catholics is limited to such help as is certainly lawful and efficacious, namely, moving them to sorrow for their sins and inducing them, as far as is prudently possible, to renounce their errors and profess the true faith. Only when these conditions are certainly fulfilled does it certainly become a matter of obligation to give them the sacraments.

Genicot does not appear to teach otherwise. The full text of the passage quoted from this author by our questioner reads: "Tenetur absolvere moribundum sacerdos, quiescunque ex

¹ Loc. cit., pp. 80-1.

² Noldin, *Summa T.M.*, III, m. 297; Regatillo, *Ius Sacramentarium*, n. 23.

sententia certo probabili licet absolvere, etiamsi forte, ob eas quas sequatur opiniones, existimet absolutionem fore invalidam."¹ To judge from this latter phrase, the priest he has in mind is one who accepts the Thomistic teaching that the acts of the penitent (confession, contrition and satisfaction) form together with absolution the proximate constitutive matter of the sacrament, and therefore regards as invalid an absolution given independently of these acts. If so, Genicot is merely saying that, in practice, such a priest must give a dying person the benefit of the contrary and certainly probable view of Ballerini and others, according to which the sacrament consists essentially in the absolution alone, and can therefore be validly given to anyone who has true sorrow, even if it be merely internal. He adds, at the end of the same section, that "there is no strict obligation of giving absolution in those more doubtful cases, in which, along with other authors especially of recent date, we have deemed it lawful", and, by way of example, he inserts a reference to what he has said above about the lawfulness of absolving dying heretics and schismatics.²

KILLING IN SELF-DEFENCE

Recent reports from the Congo and elsewhere prompt the question whether it is a culpable action for a nun, or indeed for any woman, to kill in resisting rape. Could St Maria Goretti have been canonized if she had resorted to this extreme measure? Would a religious superior be justified in supplying lethal weapons to her subjects, or a husband to his wife, for use in such an emergency? (C. L. K.)

REPLY

Any woman, nun or not, is morally entitled to use as much violence as is reasonably necessary to repel an attempted rape,

¹ *Inst. T.M.*, II (ed. 16), n. 299; (ed. 17), n. 265.

² This reference is omitted by Gortebecke, editor of the seventeenth edition.

even if the necessary means entail the death of the aggressor. On this principle all Catholic moral theologians are agreed. They agree also on its limitations. Understandably anxious to preclude the sort of trigger-happy interpretation of self-defence with which the "Westerns" regularly regale the multitude, they insist, in the terms of the Roman Law, that the "moderamen inculpatae tutelae" must not be exceeded; in other words, that no more violence be used than is reasonably thought to be necessary to the effective repelling of an actual aggression; that lethal violence shall not be used to forestall an attack that has not yet been attempted, or to avenge, except by public authority, one that has already been completed; that there must be no less drastic means of escape that is reasonably available; and finally, that the death of the aggressor shall not be intended for its own sake, as an end in itself. They differ, at least apparently, in their explanation of the reason why defence of one's life or other notable good against an unjust aggressor constitutes, even for the private individual, an exception to the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill"; though there is wide acceptance of the argument that it would be contrary to the common good if thugs had nothing to fear except the police. But the main point of difference is whether the death of the aggressor may be directly intended *as a means*, when there is no other effective escape from the aggression.

St Thomas Aquinas is generally taken to support the negative view, and certain it is that he solves the problem of private killing in self-defence by application of the principle of double effect, which requires that the intention of the agent be directed only to the good effect of self-defence and be merely permissive in regard to the likely bad effect of homicide.¹ The lead given by such a master has understandably induced many writers, ancient and modern, to take the same line.² But there have always been authors of eminence, including the great Lugo,³ who see nothing intrinsically wrong in directly intending the death of the aggressor, when there is no other

¹ *Summa Theol.*, 2a 2ae, qu. 64, a. 7.

² Billuart, *Tract. de Iure et Iustitia*, diss. 10, a. 5, §1; Aertnys-Damen, *T.M.*, I, n. 571; Vermeersch, *T.M.*, II, n. 607.

³ *Tract. de Iustitia et Iure*, disp. 10, sect. 6, n. 149.

means of stopping him; nor are they all satisfied that St Thomas committed himself definitely to the opposite view.¹

The practical difference, however, is not very great. When a woman fires a gun at a man who is attempting to rape her it is probable that her only immediate object is to stop him. What matters for her is that she is allowed to shoot. In principle, if she knew that her aggressor was in formal mortal sin and would later amend, charity would require her to prefer his eternal salvation to her own temporal life, but, in practice, such knowledge cannot be had with the certainty required to engender a strict obligation. On the other hand, she is under no moral obligation to shoot. She does no wrong, nor is her chastity or virginity morally impaired, if she limits her physical resistance to what is possible without killing, and withdraws all consent from the intimacy forced upon her.²

Since the killing of an aggressor in legitimate self-defence is a morally honest act, it cannot, *per se*, be an impediment to the posthumous canonization of the killer; but neither is it evidence of an heroic determination to die rather than offend God; and proof of heroic virtue enduring until death is necessary to canonization. Had Maria Goretti killed her aggressor, instead of choosing herself to die rather than yield to his evil desire, it is evident that, even if she too had perished in the struggle, proof of her heroic virtue might not have been so readily obtained.

Given that lethal weapons may lawfully be used in self-defence, it is *per se* justifiable to supply them to those who may need them for that purpose. Whether it would be prudent to do so in any particular case is a different question which cannot be answered confidently without knowledge of the circumstances. As a rule, however, when a religious superioress has reason to believe that her nuns are in danger of lustful assault it would seem wiser for her to arrange, if possible, for other means of evasion or protection. The "praise-the-Lord-and-pass-theammunition" approach to the problem is not generally recommended.

L. L. McR.

¹ For a scholarly study of this question, cf. Aloysius Van Hove, *Circa Quaestione de Defensione Occisiva contra Injustum Aggressorem*, in *Ephemerides Theol. Lovan.* (October 1929), p. 655 ff.

² Noldin-Schmitt, *Symma T.M.*, II, n. 332.

LEONINE PRAYERS

The Leonine prayers may be omitted after a dialogue Mass on Sundays and feast days.

1. Does a Mass with only one server answering qualify as a dialogue Mass?
2. Does "feasts" mean all feast days or only the more solemn days? (M. S. F. S.)

REPLY

1. By no stretch of the imagination could a Mass with only one server answering be called a "dialogue Mass". While there is no exact official definition of the latter—it is described in the 1958 Instruction on S. Music and Liturgy (n. 31)¹ as "plenior modus [of the participation of the faithful] cum fideles sacerdoti celebranti *liturgice respondent*, quasi cum illo 'dialogando', et *partes sibi proprias clara voce dicendo'*"—both Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* and the Instruction obviously mean a Mass at which the congregation as a body (*fideles*) take an active part by making some or all of the responses or reciting certain prayers with the celebrant. The congregation may be small, or some—as is almost inevitable—may not take any active part, all the same the faithful as a community do take a definite, active share in the rite.

2. The Leonine prayers are anomalous in several respects; they are no part of the rubrics of the rite of Mass, which never refer to them, and are rather of the nature of an "exercise of piety", and so should *per se* fall under the control of the local Ordinary (cf. 1958 Instruction nn. 1, 12), but in fact, they don't. They were prescribed by the Holy See, for the entire Latin Church and for an intention that concerns the Universal Church, and are regulated by the Holy See through decisions of *S.R.C.*

The new reply of *S.R.C.* about the Leonine prayers (9 March 1960) is merely an interpretative reply, and is really concerned with the meaning of "aliqua solemnitas" of a former

¹ Cf. *Mediator Dei*, nn. 94, 111.

reply of *S.R.C.* (20 June 1913)¹ which decided that after a Mass celebrated "cum aliqua solemnitate" the prayers might be omitted. *S.R.C.* has now decided that a Mass at which there is a homily fits this description, and so does a "dialogue Mass" but only on Sundays and feasts.

Since the word "festa" is left unqualified some rubricians think it may be taken "in its widest meaning" (*Paroisse et Liturgie*, September 1960, p. 444), and so the prayers may be omitted "on all days which are feasts, that is, whenever the feast of a mystery or of a saint is celebrated" (Fr F. R. McManus, in *Worship*, August 1960, p. 477).² This interpretation, however, seems to be too wide and to ignore the *aliqua solemnitas* with which the recent *S.R.C.* reply is concerned. And so *Ephemerides Liturgicae*³—the very authoritative liturgical periodical published in Rome and which though unofficial is in close touch with *S.R.C.*—interprets *festa* as meaning feasts of I or II class (of the new rubrics) or those celebrated with some solemnity. *L'Ami du Clergé*³ takes the same view and it seems the better one.

READER AT LOW MASS

There is nothing in the new rubrics about a reader at low Mass mentioned in the Instruction of 1958, n. 14 c., does it follow that a reader is no longer recommended? (E. T. B.)

REPLY

Why should it? The Instruction on S. Music and Liturgy of 1958 maintains its full force after the publication of the new rubrics, except there be any detail in it that has been expressly changed by the latter. The new rubrics expressly abolished only the older general rubrics of the R. Breviary and Missal, with the *Additiones et Variationes* that were added to them after the Pian Reforms of 1911 and 1913, and the general decree of *S.R.C.* of 1955 re the simplification of the rubrics (whose pro-

¹ *S.R.C.*, 4305.

² 1960, p. 460.

³ 24 November 1960 (p. 700).

visions have with a few minor changes been embodied in the new code). So the *Motu Proprio* of the Pope, n. 2. Indeed in n. 272, the code expressly refers to the 1958 Instruction.

THE SIGNAL FOR HOLY COMMUNION

Now that *Confiteor* is no longer recited before Holy Communion how is the celebrant to know if there is anyone to receive Holy Communion? (J. J. R.)

REPLY

Two solutions of this problem suggest themselves:

1. Immediately after the celebrant has received the Sacred Host and while he is meditating for some moments on the most holy sacrament (*Ritus*, X, 4) the server moves to the Epistle corner of the altar. If there is no one for Communion he brings the cruets to the altar for the ablutions and thus informs the celebrant of the absence of communicants. If there are communicants he kneels on the lowest step at the Epistle side, in view of the celebrant, until the Communion has terminated.

2. Or the bell—it would seem—may be used to give a signal. No rubric requires the ringing of the bell at the *Domine non sum dignus* of the priest, and as it has no connexion with the prayer the triple ringing is just meaningless. The use of the bell at this point of the Mass seems to have arisen, in some places only, as a signal to intending communicants to approach the altar. The practice spread and its original meaning seems to have been forgotten. It might be desirable now to make the ringing both a signal for the celebrant and for the communicants by ringing not at *Domine non sum dignus* but at the moment when the priest receives the Sacred Host. This will mean that the communicants will not be moving about at the moment of the celebrant's Communion which is undesirable, and if they begin to move up immediately after having heard the bell, some of them at least will be at the Communion rail before the priest turns around to say their *Domine non sum dignus*. It is not desirable that people should be moving about while the

celebrant is drinking the Precious Blood (at solemn Mass the deacon and subdeacon are bidden to bow deeply at the celebrant's Communion.—*Ritus X*, 8) but this seems unavoidable.

The use of the bell, without a delay in their approach, as a signal would be the only possible course if a woman was making the responses at low Mass and there was no server.

J. B. O'C.

CORRESPONDENCE

REALISM OR EMPIRICISM?

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1961, pp. 98-103)

Canon Hawkins writes:

Fr Moore, in THE CLERGY REVIEW for February 1961, evidently upholds the maxim that the best method of defence is attack, for his intended vindication of Fr Lonergan's philosophy contains little to Fr Lonergan's advantage but much to my own disadvantage. In fact Fr Moore lays about him with such *abandon* that even the ranks of Tuscany can scarce forbear to cheer. The ranks of Tuscany, however, must be allowed to comment that the display is not all as relevant as it is rumbustious. When, for example, I am reproached with a lack of enthusiasm for the latest ideas, a few moments' reflexion should suffice to show Fr Moore that it is equally unreasonable either to accept or to reject the latest ideas indiscriminately. Hence from my lack of sympathy with Fr Lonergan by itself there follows nothing for or against either Fr Lonergan or myself.

Fr Moore so dislikes the notion of a primary intellectual awareness of the singular that he seems to forget that we all agree that there is a primary awareness of the singular, at least on the level of sensation. I happen to think that it is always misleading to say "The senses know . . ." or "The intellect knows . . .". It is *we* who know, and human perceptual awareness is always implicitly an existential judgement. This would be an interesting question to debate on another occasion, but my point in relation to Fr Lonergan does not depend upon it. My point is that a mere vindication of knowing in the abstract is not very helpful without some account of the sorts of thing which enter into our experience and upon which the analytic and inferential functions of thinking can operate. Hence the importance of the fundamental evidences of common sense.

Fr Moore seems anxious to discuss the unity or plurality of substantial forms. This also would be an interesting question in another context, but it does not seem to have any connexion with Fr Lonergan's book.

What Fr Moore does say about Fr Lonergan is that the latter seeks to "get from Thomist psychology to Thomist realism". That is precisely my difficulty, for it seems to be putting the cart before the horse. Whatever else St Thomas may say, he does surely say clearly and rightly that knowing is to be understood by its relation to being rather than being by its relation to knowing. This seems to be fundamental to Thomistic or any other realism, and the attempt to reverse the order is wrongheaded.

It was always reassuring after an air raid to look out of the window in the morning and to see everything as it was the evening before. After Fr Moore's bombardment the question of Fr Lonergan's philosophy seems to me to be unaltered. That is a pity. I should be very ready and glad to admit that there was more to it than I succeeded in assimilating, but I felt bound to express the misgivings which arose in my mind because they were the result of explicit statements in the text. These misgivings remain.

DOMINUS VOBISCUM

Fr Dominic Devas writes:

Why are we no longer allowed to say *Dominus vobiscum* when the Office is recited alone? Centuries ago a simple hermit—no liturgical expert, surely—found himself beset with misgivings over the matter: "*The Lord be with you, but there's nobody there.*" He consulted St Peter Damian. In return the hermit received a masterpiece of theology in which St Peter, after quickly reassuring the hermit and bidding him stick to his plurals, gave a magnificent description of the Church, in which occurs the splendid phrase *in singulis tota* (Cap. V in the treatise *Dominus vobiscum*). Must that glorious vision of truth fade out before the exigencies of—well, what?

THE CELEBRANT SINGING *Gloria* AND *Sanctus*

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1961, pp. 110-11)

Fr Gregory Swann writes:

In all probability the *Gloria* was chanted by the bishop alone, in the same way as the Preface and *Pater Noster* (Gastoné, *Les origines du*

chant Romain, p. 59). The earliest chant known is found in the Roman Gradual Ord. XV, and was used also for the *Pater Noster* in the Mozarabic Liturgy (P.L. 85 col. 559).

By the time of *Ordo Romanus I* (eighth century, but probably the use of the sixth) the choir took part in, or completely annexed, the *Gloria*, for we read: "The bishop turning towards the people begins *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, and immediately turns again to the east until it is finished. After this, turning again to the people and saying *Pax vobis*, he turns to the east and says *Oremus* and the prayer. After that is finished, he sits down and likewise the bishops and priests" for the Epistle (P.L. 78 col. 942).

From this it will be seen that the bishop stood during the whole of the *Gloria* and probably joined in it. It is surely extremely incongruous for the chief offerer of the Holy Sacrifice to sit down during the *Kyrie* and this sublime hymn of praise to the Holy Trinity. The present permission to sit undoubtedly arose only when the choir performed some interminable opera! The celebrant therefore has every right to stand for the *Gloria*, if he wishes, and to join in singing it, instead of hurriedly reciting it. The same of course applies to the *Credo*, which is the solemn profession of the Catholic faith, in which all should join.

It is doubtful whether the congregation at Mass ever sang the *Gloria* until the eleventh or twelfth century, when it was extended to priests on Sundays and festivals. Sicard, Bp. of Cremona (+1215) in his treatise *Mitrale* (P.L. 213, col. 97) says that the priest intoned it and the people joyfully joined in.

In the same *Ordo I* we find the following concerning the Preface and Canon. "When the offertory is finished, the regional sub-deacons go behind the altar, facing the bishop, so that when he says *Per omnia*, or *Dominus vobiscum*, or *Sursum corda*, or *Gratias*, they may be ready to reply, standing erect until they begin to say the angelic hymn, that is *Sanctus*; and when they have finished it, the bishop alone stands up and begins the canon. The bishops, deacons, sub-deacons and priests remain in the presbytery bowing down" (§16), until *Nobis quoque*.

From this it is clear the *Te igitur* began only when the *Sanctus* was finished. In the Gelasian Sacramentary the title *Canon actionis* begins with the preface. It is one long prayer, and it should be possible for everyone present to join in the whole of it. This is impossible if the celebrant begins *Te igitur* before the *Sanctus* is ended.

This ideal was achieved for many years at Lostock Hall by singing the *Sanctus* from the *Te Deum* or the Gradual no. XVIII, in which the celebrant and congregation joined. But other chants from

the Gradual, nos. X and XII to XVI are equally suitable, and take literally one minute to sing. This causes no serious delay!

THE SOUL AND THE HUMAN EMBRYO

Fr Benet Innes writes:

The recent, and rather disgusting, experiment recently performed in Italy of fertilizing and allowing a human ovum to develop *in vitro* for twenty-nine days raises some problems which some of your learned readers may help to solve.

Theologians teach that the human soul is present at the first moment of conception and most people would understand this as being the moment when fertilization is complete, though neither St Thomas nor Aristotle would appear to agree with them. The biological facts appear to be on the side of St Thomas.

A fertilized human ovum in its earliest stages of development surely cannot have a human soul, because it might give rise to identical twins, or quins, by fission and it is difficult to see how the one soul could be divided. It is only at a later stage of development that the cells lose their potentiality to become each a whole organism and are determined to a particular destination in one organism. Even so it is difficult to say at what stage the embryo becomes one organism instead of a colony of cells. It might be possible for a given cell at quite a late stage to retain the potentiality to develop into a complete organism.

It looks as if "conception" may be a more elastic term than we thought, or at any rate more difficult to pin down to a definite biological state.

MISSIONARY SPIRITUALITY

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1961, pp. 123-4)

Fr. Bernard Kelly writes:

Reviewing my *Missionary Spirituality*, S.M.S. has a number of kind things to say. In regard to the few points he criticized he may, however, have overlooked what might be said in my defence. The sentence he quotes from p. 89, though a platitude in isolation, is meaningful in its context. The situation envisaged on p. 92 was suggested by experience. The sentence he quotes from p. 105, taken in its context and in the context of our present-day search for a

spirituality peculiar to the various walks of the Christian life, deserves something better than the reviewer's sarcasm. The question which we are told is asked on p. 120 but left without an answer is answered on the same page and the answer is developed throughout the chapter from which it is taken. The question itself summarizes three approaches to the missionary apostolate which have actually been tried out at different times. Finally, the book has only a very remote connexion with seminary lectures and does not, in my opinion, deal anywhere with obvious points of which missionary readers do not need to be reminded.

S.M.S. doesn't like my style. I have been writing for over twenty years and, of British reviewers who have referred during that period to my style, most praised it, some of them highly. Admittedly it is not perfect. But I think that it can be supported without difficulty or exasperation by anyone who appreciates the practical value of what I have to say and the experience that suggested it.

BOOK REVIEWS

BIOGRAPHY

Father Faber. By Ronald Chapman. (Burns & Oates, 35s.)

MR RONALD CHAPMAN has drawn fully upon the abundant material in both the London Oratory and the Birmingham Oratory for this very lively, readable and revealing biography and with it has made a full-length portrait of an extraordinary man. Until Westminster Cathedral was opened the Brompton Oratory was, quite apart from its size or topographical situation, the most important Catholic church in the country, even though its founder had been dead for forty years. For this reason it may well be considered that the biographer's treatment adheres almost too closely to *minutiae*; for instance, a very full account of the trivial causes of the dissension between London and Birmingham, though this indeed has the rather startling interest of showing Newman in a new and unfavourable light. For many readers today names like Dalgairns, Bowden, St John, Ryder will mean very little; a little more of the background, a clear bibliography of Faber's works (and hymns) and an adequate chapter on Faber as a writer would have been more informative than twelve and a half pages of textual references at the end of the book; yet the interest of the narrative will hold the reader to the last

page. This handsomely produced book is unquestionably a notable contribution to the story of the Catholic Church in England.

An Evangelical by heredity, by upbringing and above all by temperament, a Tractarian in principle, and then a Catholic by conviction, Faber was a remarkable instance of a man keeping throughout his life something of the mentality of the religion of his early years. Ardent, imaginative, impulsive, wayward and inconstant, given to rapid changes from one extreme to another, Faber was a born mystic holding every opinion at its maximum and expressing it with vehemence. It was his nature to welcome any theological proposition that was shocking to Protestants: he habitually spoke of our Lady as "Dear Mamma" and of the Church of England as "Old Mother Damnable". When converted, he declared that he had been "in revolt against the Catholic Church for thirty-one years", i.e. since he was born. His "Mariolatry" was extreme and his addiction to illiturgical Neapolitan devotions almost aggressive; he adored and imposed the Baroque; he mimicked St Philip Neri; and sober-minded English Catholics were astonished at his credulity and his commendation of extravagant austerities.

For all that, Faber was an heroic type; he endured lifelong suffering on account of a peculiar and probably inherited constitution. His father and mother both died young; near relatives of his were "never very well". He himself died at the age of forty-nine after long and terrible suffering. In spite of constant illness, Bright's disease and finally dropsy, he accomplished an enormous work and created a powerful tradition; to many converts in his day, and to innumerable devout souls ever since, he has been a very compelling spiritual guide.

His relations with Newman, prolonged, constant and always uneasy, take up a large portion of the book. His attitude to Newman was one of hero-worship. He worried Newman by perpetually seeking his guidance and expecting approval that Newman was disinclined to give. There was not only divergence of views but—on Newman's part—a temperamental antipathy, for he disliked all that was excessive, extravagant and theatrical. As early as 1845 Newman had told him: "You are meant for a separate theatre of influence"; when Faber referred to this observation, he preferred to phrase it as a "separate centre of influence". Newman, we know, was a master of *la parole nuancée*. He could have had no great personal liking for Faber and the friction that becomes so evident in the latter part of the story would not have been alleviated by Faber's intimate friendship with W. G. Ward. The latter actually asked Faber the surprisingly obtuse question: was it not remarkable that Fr Newman

succeeds in none of his undertakings. Ward, of all people, had every reason for knowing why.

While keeping closely upon the lines of the copious correspondence placed at his disposal, Mr Chapman makes some forthright pronouncements of his own. We are told of Newman's "bitterness" and "femininity"; of the "streak of cruelty" in Faber who, moreover, was "not to be trusted in a business transaction". He quotes, too, from "Wilfred Ward's great but misleading biography"; he does, however, give us one of Faber's witticisms: "Wiseman, when in full tog, looked like some Japanese God."

In an effective passage he insists upon what it was that really effected Faber's conversion—the "new Catholicism" which the ardent Tractarian saw on his first visit to Rome. "The spirit of this Catholicism," says Mr Chapman, "was almost the antithesis of the spirit of the Old [English] Catholics. It was a Catholicism brought to birth in, and in opposition to, the world of eighteenth-century rationalism—warm, enthusiastic, romantic. It hated the least hint of Erastianism. It emphasized devotion to the humanity of Christ and to His mother. It was essentially evangelical, a revival of personal religion."

When in 1843, two years before his reception, Faber sank down at the feet of Gregory XVI he had, whether he knew it or not, already made his submission, then and there.

J. J. DWYER

Diary of a Misfit Priest. By W. Rowland Jones. (George Allen & Unwin. 25s.)

The earlier part of this story reads like a real-life parallel to the famous trilogy Sir Compton Mackenzie wrote about *The Parson's Progress*. There is the same delight in High-Church mummery, the same leftward trend, the interviews with bishops, the ordination with its vigil spent in the episcopal palace. Indeed, the sub-title of the book might have been: "Bishops I have met." Welldon, Gore, Hensley Henson are all sketched to the life. After one political crisis the author was "seconded" to the King's Weigh House, where he was for some years assistant to Dr Orchard, having been re-ordained by the late Bishop Herford. Catholics will be somewhat critical of what the author writes about Dr Orchard's conversion. The facts were related in *From Faith to Faith*, and although Orchard had some difficulty over his saying in the profession of faith that he "detested" his former heresies, it is a travesty of the incident that Dr Rowland Jones reproduces here. It was not that he was "required to denounce

as heretics all those who had associated with him in the Weigh House experiment", or that a casuist at the English College told him that "the words of this damnatory clause were not half so bad if they were said in Latin", but that it was pointed out to him that the word *detestor* means "to renounce under oath" and does not involve any emotional attitude to the heresy, still less to the heretics concerned. One can see in the case of Newman how Anglicanism had an emotional colouring for him, though he did not let it influence his judgement or his decision. Inaccuracies appear in the book, as when the Holy Name church at Manchester is called "Holy Innocents". The author does not carry the story down to the present day, but ends with a monitory diatribe against reunion movements. "Unity with Rome would be disloyalty to Christ", he claims; one wonders if it is not he, rather than Dr Orchard, who, in the words of Dr Leslie Weatherhead's Foreword, has "got lost in an ecclesiastical jungle".

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.

Mary Ward. By Mary Oliver, I.B.V.M. 229 pp. (Sheed & Ward. 18s.)

ACUSTOMED as we are to largely autonomous communities of nuns working among us in hospital, school and home, it is hard for us to realize what a shock it must have been to the seventeenth-century mind, whether lay or cleric, when Mary Ward first suggested such an order of women. To us the objections made, the obstacles placed in her path, the scheming and plotting that went on in order to suppress her efforts seem to be more evil than ludicrous. She realized that one of the major problems facing the English Catholics of her day was the education of their children. She proposed that as priests and monks could not in the circumstances do the work, women should be specially trained for the task. They should live under a rule (for which purpose she adapted the rule of St Ignatius), take vows, and be as far as possible completely independent of external clerical control. More than any other of her innovations it was this last that earned for her the bitter abuse and obstruction of so many—a bitterness which for one period caused her to be imprisoned as a heretic. That she managed in spite of such intense antagonism to achieve so much during her own lifetime is due to her evident sanctity and common sense—she captivated all who met her in person, whatever their prejudices about her or about her work.

The present life is based on Mary Ward's own autobiography, the biography written by her friend and companion Winifred Wigmore and the contemporary series of paintings *The Painted Life of Mary Ward*. It is vividly written and conveys extremely well the

vivacity, charm, courage, humour and holiness of her whom Pius XII once referred to as "that incomparable woman".

Abbé Pouget Discourses. By Jean Guitton. Translated by Fergus Murphy. 163 pp. (Clonmore & Reynolds. 21s.)

THE true art of the biographer is, I suppose, to draw his subject without at the same time drawing himself; to leave the reader with a real image of his hero, an image which, though seen through the eyes of all who knew the man, is yet balanced and unbiased. How M. Guitton does this I do not know, for he himself is constantly speaking in these scenic discourses. Yet at the end the picture with which one is left is that of M. Pouget alone, the blind peasant Vincentian priest who for twenty-seven years held lively and distinguished court with philosophers, exegetes and theologians, scholars all, in his dingy cell in the Vincentian house in Paris.

It is a man of great wisdom who lives in these pages, a man too of sanctity. In his own inimitable, forthright fashion he speaks to us of the problems of his day, of Modernism, of the Resurrection, of historical criticism, of sin and evil, of the plurality of worlds, of the new physics (he was a competent amateur mathematician and physicist before he became blind). He listens to Jean Guitton talking about the atom bomb, about worker priests, and answers (as undoubtedly he would have answered) in terms that are both realistic and comforting. We learn of his meeting with Loisy whose criticism had been so self-destructive, and with Bergson whose tremendous humility impressed M. Pouget so much.

Above all there stands this striking figure acknowledged by Bergson, Maurice Legendre, Emile Genty, Mauriac, Claudel as being of true eminence. M. Guitton concludes his Preface with these words: "I have striven to infuse the breath of human life into this book, a life where the Idea is entwined with the little detail, where anguish, thought and a smile are always somewhat mixed together." He has nobly succeeded.

D. K.

HISTORY

Histoire du Christianisme. Par Dom Charles Poulet. Avec le concours de plusieurs collaborateurs publiée par les soins de J. Sécher.

Epoque Contemporaine. Fascicules xxxvii-xxxviii. (Beauchesne et ses Fils. Broché. By subscription.)

THIS double number carries on (see THE CLERGY REVIEW, July

1958) in five more chapters the story of the Church in France under the Third Republic as far as the Clemenceau-Briand ministry of 1907. As before, these 170 pages contain a good deal of detail and are enlivened by many quotations from the utterances of the principal actors and by many portraits from the Bibliothèque Nationale. They are followed by four chapters (about eighty pages) on "La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre", extending from the Relief Acts at the end of the eighteenth century to Balfour's government in 1904. This, it may be remarked, while not possessing the authority and the intimacy of the narrative about France, is very well done; in fact, much better than one would have expected.

The real story of the Third Republic begins with the famous *Seize Mai 1877*, as a result of which a coalition of the Left, strongly inimical to the Church, came into power. The Right, hopelessly divided between Legitimists, Orleanists and Bonapartists ("three men can't sit upon one throne", said Thiers), had already given signal proofs of political incapacity. The Comte de Chambord, a born *émigré*, if ever there was one, spurning all compromise, had refused the throne for the sake of the White Flag. "Tout ça," said Pius IX, "pour une serviette!" Apart from the virtual certainty that the Comte de Chambord would not have occupied the throne very long, for the France of his imagination did not exist and never had existed, the Right had exhibited the utmost folly over the Roman Question. In 1873, only two years after *l'année terrible*, several bishops, and of course *L'Univers*, had actually demanded that France should threaten Italy with war unless Victor Emmanuel evacuated Rome. All this provided a ready-made platform for Gambetta, Jules Ferry, Paul Bert and the like. The insane hatred of religion revealed in the Commune had merely gone underground for a time and now the masonic lodges, strongly represented in both Houses, declared remorseless war.

The continual lack of judgement shown by the Right was seen in the attempt to form a specifically Catholic Party just as, later on, in the support unwisely given to General Boulanger. As early as 1880 Leo XIII employed Archbishop Lavigerie to work for a compromise but he got no help from the French bishops. In the result the electorate preferred the very questionable probity of the Republicans to the obvious ineptitude of the Royalists. Fanaticism bred counter-fanaticism. Paul Bert announced that they had declared war on *le Bon Dieu* and meant to win, while Cardinal Pitra actually included the names of Lacordaire, Montalembert and Dupanloup in the same diatribe with those of Lamennais, Renan and Loyson, thereby provoking the question: "aut Pitra aut Petrus?" Dupanloup him-

self thought fit to oppose the election of that eminent lexicographer, Littré, to the French Academy, which is primarily a body engaged in making a dictionary.

The eventual failure of "Le Ralliement" was, however, plainly due to the irreconcilable hostility of the Lodges which had no intention of modifying one iota of their "republican legislation" and obviously wanted to keep the Church as the target of their attack, an attack for which they would have had no excuse had "La Ralliement" succeeded.

The melancholy story continues with the Dreyfus Case, Waldeck-Rousseau's Law of Associations, the expulsion of the Religious Orders and the closing of thousands of Catholic schools. The ferocious apostate, Emile Combes, so extreme that he was disavowed by Waldeck-Rousseau, made no secret of his aims: "First let us get rid of the monks, then we shall deal with the parish priests and with the '*budget des cultes*'. Then came the unhappy affair of the bishops of Laval and Dijon. Combes' preposterous claim to appoint and translate bishops without reference to the Holy See might not have carried him all the way, but unfortunately he was presented with a colourable excuse for his plan of using Loubet's visit to Rome to force an open rupture with the Holy See. Cardinal Merry del Val, not content with the protest that he had every right and reason to make, proceeded to circulate to the other Powers a copy of the vehement remonstrance which he had addressed to the Quai d'Orsay. By some mistake this also went to Monaco—where there was no nuncio—and the document was transmitted to Jean Jaurès, who promptly published it in *L'Humanité*.

The separation was completed and everybody knows how Pius X, rejecting all Briand's slippery proposals for compromise, "*associations cultuelles*", lodging of notice at the prefecture or municipality, "*contrat de jouissance*" and so on, deliberately chose the full liberty of the Church in preference to the retention of any property whatsoever; whereupon there ensued a comparative calm down to the outbreak of the Great War.

Short of bloodshed, the long and bitter struggle repeated in a measure that strange phenomenon of the Revolution, when an Established Church was persecuted by the secular authority in the name of Liberty. The resemblance was, at times, very close: the same animus, the same arguments, even the same language. However, the Church in France emerged from the storm, impoverished but unified, freed from the trammels of a Concordat that had been systematically abused; reading the dramatic story the reader may well recall her ancient motto, *Fluctuat Nec Mergitur*.

The Age of Martyrs; Christianity from Diocletian to Constantine. By Giuseppe Ricciotti. Translated by the Rev. Anthony Bull, C.R.L. (Geoffrey Chapman, London. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 24s.)

IT HAS become usual to make large claims for almost every book. We are told in the preface to this compilation that it is intended to be "a critical narrative of the facts . . . and to present the overall development of the story" and again that it "is intended for historians and generally educated people". They will, the reader is assured, welcome the absence of footnotes, a fact "which allows the book to be read continuously". What it actually contains is a plain account of the Tetrarchy of the Roman Empire that began a year after the accession of Diocletian in 284; some ninety pages about the Great Persecution (303-12); the civil war, the victory and subsequent reign of Constantine. The greater part of these 300 pages is therefore a plain piece of Roman history expanded by transcriptions from the various *Acta Martyrum*, *Acta Sanctorum* and the like, mostly to be found in Ruinart, along with some necessary information about Eusebius and Lactantius. Allusion is fairly frequently made to the vast critical work of modern scholarship in this field and its conclusions are, so to speak, taken over *en bloc* side by side with the traditional and legendary narratives but with little specific application to them. The result is a curious kind of mechanical mixture instead of a chemical compound.

The title itself is a traditional phrase adopted from the chronological practice of the Alexandrian astronomers whereby the period of the persecution was identified with the whole reign of Diocletian instead of being dated from the edicts of Galerius which were issued in 303. This is the explanation of the death of a martyr being stated in many books as (say) 285 or 288, whereas it would really have occurred in the second or fifth war year of the general persecution.

It is clearly pointed out that pious inventions (not unmixed with *le goût de l'horrible*) "have created around the Acts a great stagnant pool of useless and unreliable stories" and that the fact that a certain *Passio* contains little or no historical truth is no proof that the martyr did not exist. This is, of course, the basic thesis of the Bollandists that the cult preceded—and created—the legend, not *vice versa*. Thus Fr Ricciotti recites the familiar legend of St Sebastian and adds the very reasonable comment that Sebastian was possibly the victim of the "purge" in the army which came before the general persecution but that his direct relations with Diocletian are certainly legendary. The same can be said about the Theban Legion—as if a

commander in the field would try to massacre a whole division of his army. Individual cases of refusal to sacrifice, or even to serve at all, must have been treated as mutiny; and if that was widespread in the forces it may well have provoked Galerius. Diocletian himself was not a persecutor at all and it is aptly pointed out that of his whole reign he spent barely a month in Rome. There is not a word here about St George.

For the rest there is some discussion of the Donation of Constantine (ineptly translated as "dowry"), and much more about the Donatists and the Arians. It might have been observed that the real donation of Constantine lay in the departure to the new Rome whereby the Eternal City was eventually left in the hands of the Pope.

There is a very careful account of Arius and the Council of Nicaea. While all that is doubtless theologically accurate, the author might have taken the opportunity of explaining, as a historian, how it was that Arianism and semi-Arianism took such a strong and widespread hold. It was surely because it was an obvious half-way house for converts from philosophical paganism who held monotheistic views about the *Summus Deus*, or rather, the *Summa Divinitas*; while, on the other hand, to Goths and other barbarians, especially Teutonic, it would be axiomatic that the Son was less important than the Father.

The translation is undistinguished and the spelling is American.

J. J. DWYER

SHORT NOTICES

Anima Christi Meditations. By Adrian Lyons, O.F.M. 116 pp. (Clonmore & Reynolds Ltd. 10s. 6d.)

ELEVEN meditations, one on each phrase of the *Anima Christi*, intended for use at Mass, Holy Communion, holy hours and visits to the Blessed Sacrament. Simple and sound enough, but very worn in sentiment and language.

Mary in Their Midst: The Legion of Mary in Action in China 1948-1951.

Compiled by Leo Roberts, s.v.d., and Supplement compiled by Fr Aedan McGrath. 75 pp. (Clonmore & Reynolds Ltd. 5s.)

STORIES about the heroic Chinese Legionaries, contributed by missionaries. The accounts are plain, factual reports, without art or embellishment, but they tell a wonderful and moving story. Essential reading for Legionaries. And, surely, for others also. How can we

remain so indifferent to the faith, courage and sufferings of our brothers and sisters in China?

Sur les pas du Christ: le rosaire. By Marie-Alain Fauvarque, O.P. 124 pp. (P. Lethielleux, Paris. 4.80 NF.)

SIMPLE considerations on the mysteries of the rosary, written so as to convey some catechetical instruction and intended chiefly for children between eleven and fifteen. The book has no features out of the ordinary and will not interest readers in this country.

The Way: A Quarterly Review of Christian Spirituality. Vol. I, No. 1, January 1961. (Published by *The Month*, 31 Farm Street, London, W.1. Annual subscription 30s.)

THIS new Jesuit quarterly deserves a great welcome. It gets off to a fine start with an outstanding first number. Fr D'Arcy discusses modern spirituality. A forthright article by Fr Crane on the present situation in Great Britain shows that the review intends to come to grips with reality in the concrete; and there are two companion articles, one on the United States and the other on Australia. A group of four articles under the heading *Towards the Resurrection* provides suitable reading for Lent. The first is a brilliant essay by Fr McKenzie, "Into the Desert", which by itself would make the number worth getting. Then come what will be regular features: aids to Scripture reading, a selection of texts from spiritual writings, the first instalment of a spiritual vocabulary and some notes on recent books. If the Editors can maintain this standard, they should have no difficulty in securing a wide readership.

Towards Christian Unity: An Introduction to the Ecumenical Movement. By Michael Hurley, S.J. 36 pp. (Catholic Truth Society of Ireland. 3d.)

A WELL-WRITTEN pamphlet, giving a good, sympathetic account which will be helpful in arousing the interest of ordinary Catholics. It is surprising that there is no mention of the late Abbé Couturier and his work, and the question of Christian values in other Churches and of the possible gain to the Catholic Church from reunion is disposed of too glibly. But worthy of recommendation.

C. D.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Printed in England by THE ANCHOR PRESS LTD., Tiptree, Essex, and published for the proprietors by THE TABLET PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 14 HOWICK PLACE, S.W.1, in the County of London.

our

124

as
for
out

I,
on,

o a
uses
ent
to
ion
A
tion
by
the
res:
gs,
ent
ave

ent.
of

unt
ics.
rier
hes
n is

for
, in